



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 6, 2007

No. 38

House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. GIFFORDS).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

Washington, DC, March 6, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GABRIELLE GIFFORDS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

WE MUST TAKE CARE OF OUR VETERANS

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, historically, the month of March has been a time when we greet representatives of our Nation's veterans who come to Capitol Hill to advocate on behalf of their fellow veterans. This year, however, it is hard not to feel a sense of shame as we see the veterans spreading out over Capitol Hill again carrying their message. Sadly, as has been shown in our hearings and on the front pages of our papers around the country in countless news accounts, Congress

has done a poor job of listening to their needs in the past, and we are seeing more than ever the need to address those concerns directly.

I haven't supported the reckless treatment of our veterans. I have supported our Democratic efforts when we were in the minority, fighting for appropriate funding and equipment. But we can only go so far with an administration that has been focused on its own version of reality and its own priorities very much at variance with our veterans, and that have been enabled for the last 6 years by a Republican leadership with their own sense of priorities.

We have seen and heard from our veterans about the long waits, the red tape. It is not, however, the fault of some faceless bureaucracy as implied by Vice President CHENEY yesterday, because there are countless dedicated men and women who still provide good care for most of our veterans and who want to do better. It is an administration and its policies and the people that they have put in charge that must change. And, of course, it is the war in Iraq, itself.

It is not just a question of money. We have given plenty of money to this administration, more in fact than they have asked for. We are spending more on our military and veterans than the entire rest of the world combined. But because of the mismanagement, we have been giving too much to the wrong people to do the wrong things, dealing with the wrong priorities.

I just left a budget hearing. We are still looking at an administration that wants to lavish billions on missile defense and Cold War era weapons, while having proposals that would cut programs for traumatic brain injury and, according to the Congressional Budget Office, underfund our veterans' needs by some \$3.4 billion over the next 5 years.

We are dealing with an administration that has put political operatives

in sensitive positions. The head of the Veterans Administration, for example, is a former head of the Republican Party who was surprised about the budget problems, whose administration forgot about the thousands of returning veterans that were going to need more services, who was baffled by the security lapses in the veterans' files on VA computers.

This last week, I hope the tide is turning. I hope that finally the spotlight that has been focused on amplifying the concerns that a number of us have heard and have talked about in the past, will make a case that will not be possible for this administration to ignore any longer.

Mr. Vice President, it's not just the Federal bureaucracy. It's your bureaucracy after 6 years. It's your budgets, your priorities, your leaders who are failing.

I am confident that this Congress will be able to turn the tide so next year, when our veterans' representatives are here on Capitol Hill, we are not going to feel guilty; that we will be able to look our young men and women who are in the service today and the people who are recovering from their service overseas in the eye, knowing that we, this Congress, the administration and the American people have done all we could for them.

FIRST COOLING, NOW WARMING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

My colleagues, here is a quote from a Newsweek article: "There are ominous signs that the Earth's weather patterns have begun to change dramatically, and that these changes may portend a drastic decline in food production, with

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2167

serious political implications for about every nation on Earth. The drop in food output could begin quite soon, perhaps only 10 years from now."

My colleagues, Newsweek published this dire warning in its April 28, 1975 issue, years before global warming began getting the headlines it does today.

Did Newsweek accurately forecast the coming of global warming more than 30 years ago? No. The article entitled "The Cooling World" warned that the Earth's climate seemed to be cooling to the point that populations around the world are in imminent danger because of the coming ice age.

Newsweek was not the only publication to warn about the supposed threat of global cooling during the 1970s. In an article entitled "Another Ice Age?" the June 24, 1974 issue of Time reported: "When meteorologists take an average temperature around the globe, they find that the atmosphere has been growing gradually cooler for the past three decades." And Time's article did not predict a break in this decade-long cooling trend.

The article continued to warn that "telltale signs were everywhere, from the unexpected persistence and thickness of packed ice in the waters around Iceland to the southward migration of warm-loving creatures like the armadillo from the Midwest."

Fortune magazine also gave warning. A February 1974 article entitled "Ominous Changes in the World's Weather" claimed that "there is a fair agreement among researchers that the earth is now heading very slowly into another major ice age, such as the one that brought the glaciers deep into North America before it retreated some 10,000 years ago."

This article also pointed to the supposedly unusual weather patterns of the day as indication of much worse weather to come: "Climatologists now blame those recurring droughts and floods on a global cooling trend. It could bring massive tragedies for mankind."

These days, of course, we no longer hear much, if anything, about the possibility of runaway global cooling triggering another ice age. Instead, we hear a lot about the threat of catastrophic global warming. Now, what happened? Well, the temperature trend changed. After dropping for about 35 years, the temperature started to rise in the mid seventies, although the global temperature now is only slightly higher than it was in the 1940s when the cooling trend began.

Over the centuries and millennia, the weather has changed, at times radically. During the 10th century, the Vikings established prosperous colonies in Greenland, having named the island for its lush pastures. By the early 15th century, however, these were wiped out by cold and hunger, and now four-fifths of Greenland lies buried under hundreds of feet of ice cap. No one blamed human activity for this climate shift or the ice age.

But in the seventies, some experts argued that human impact on the environment had grown to the point where their atmospheric pollutants were contributing significantly to global cooling, just as some experts argue that CO₂ and other greenhouse gas emissions are causing global warming today.

Climatologists suggested that dust and other particles released into the atmosphere as a result of farming and the burning of fossil fuels were blocking more and more sunlight from reaching and heating the surface of the Earth. They projected that man's potential to pollute would increase six- to eightfold over the next 50 years. And as Reid Bryson stated in Fortune in February 1974, "It is something that, if it continues, will affect the whole human occupation of the Earth, like a billion people starving."

Another of the concerned scientists was Dr. Stephen Schneider, the co-author of the Science report, who in the seventies was worried about the threat of global cooling. Now at Stanford University, Dr. Schneider not only sees things differently but is considered one of the leading experts now sounding the alarm about global warming. In a recent MSNBC report, Dr. Schneider argued that today's warming trend "has been induced by humans using the atmosphere as a free place to dump our tailpipe waste." However, not everyone sounded the alarm about global cooling in the seventies, just like not everyone is sounding the alarm about global warming today.

Madam Speaker, the fact that so many experts were wrong about global cooling in the seventies does not necessarily mean that they are wrong about global warming today, but it does at least show that experts are sometimes incredibly, incredibly wrong.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 43 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. WOOLSEY) at noon.

PRAYER

The Reverend Stan Gruneich, National Chaplain, The American Legion, offered the following prayer:

Holy God, our help in ages past, present and future. In this place of history and memory, we remember with gratitude that You have blessed our Nation with this great land as our her-

itage for this space in time. Grant that in humility we all may live worthy of that trust.

Bless this legislative body with clear vision, deep insight and courage to seek and do what is right. In Your gracious mercy, Lord, may each strive to see the best in everyone else. It is then that we can discern what is best for all here and in the world around us.

We pray for the men and women of our military services. Sustain them and their families during difficult times. Give Your comfort to the wounded in body or mind. Grant eternal rest to those who died in the line of duty.

Lord, hear our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. HERSETH led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND STAN GRUNEICH

(Ms. HERSETH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HERSETH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Reverend Stan Gruneich, National Chaplain of the American Legion, as guest chaplain of the House of Representatives.

On behalf of the entire House, thank you, Reverend, for your prayer, for serving as guest chaplain, for your military service to this country, and for your service to the American Legion as national chaplain. We are honored to have you here today.

Reverend Gruneich was appointed National Chaplain of the American Legion on August 30, 2006. A U.S. Army Vietnam-era veteran, he received his bachelor of arts degree and his master's in divinity from the University of Sioux Falls in Sioux Falls, South Dakota.

He is a member of the Kelly-Porter Post 70 in Flandreau, South Dakota. During his 22 years in the American Legion, Chaplain Gruneich has held several key positions. In addition to serving as post commander, he brings 15 years of experience as the South Dakota department chaplain to the floor today.

Reverend Gruneich, I look forward to continuing to work with you and your

colleagues in the American Legion to ensure our Nation's veterans receive the benefits they have earned and deserve.

Madam Speaker, thank you. And thank you again to the Reverend, as we thank him for sharing his spiritual guidance and wisdom here today in the House of Representatives and for his commitment to serving his fellow veterans.

SCOTT GARDNER ACT

(Mrs. MYRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MYRICK. Today, I reintroduce the Scott Gardner Act. Tragically, Scott Gardner, who was a loving husband and father, was killed by a drunk illegal alien who remained in our country even though he had previous DWI convictions.

And we have had other constituents killed recently. Jasmine Lawrence and Min Chang were both killed in wrecks caused by drunk-driving illegal immigrants in Charlotte, North Carolina, area roads.

Most recently, 20-year-old LeeAnna Newman and her unborn child were killed just outside of my district after her car was struck by an illegal alien who later admitted to getting behind the wheel after drinking tequila. He had a previous conviction also in North Carolina.

This act will give our law enforcement and immigration officials the capacity and resources to deal with illegal aliens driving under the influence in a manner that fits the crime. It would make DWI grounds for mandatory detention and deportation of illegal aliens, and it would aid law enforcement and our immigration laws by requiring the sharing of information among Federal, State and local law enforcement agencies, who would be required to collect this information during the course of their normal duties.

State and local law enforcement agencies would be given the resources required to detain illegal aliens for DWI and immigration violations until they could be transferred to Federal authorities for deportation.

It is a travesty that our country allows illegal immigrants to remain after being found guilty of DWI.

We cannot prevent every instance of illegal aliens driving under the influence.

However, there is no reason we should not take every measure possible to remove habitual DWI offenders from our roads.

Our constituents expect us to ensure their safety and security.

The Scott Gardner Act will go a long way toward clearing our roads of criminal illegal aliens who represent a grave threat to the safety of our citizens.

THE EMPLOYEE FREE CHOICE ACT

(Mr. ALTMIRE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALTMIRE. Madam Speaker, the new Democratic Congress continues to listen to the concerns of middle-class Americans.

We know that average American families have actually lost ground over the past several years, even after several years of economic growth and high corporate profits. Wages are stagnant, personal debts are at an all-time high, and individual savings are at an all-time low. Higher education and health care costs are skyrocketing.

Last week, the Democratic Congress took a step towards helping middle-class families by passing the Employee Free Choice Act, which helps Americans join together to bargain for better wages, benefits and working conditions.

Once again, our legislation passed with bipartisan support, and once again, it will benefit working families across this country. This is just one more example of how the new Congress is leading this Nation in a new direction, just as the American people asked us to do last November.

SLOW-BLEED IS NO OPTION

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, right now, brave Americans are going door to door in some of the most dangerous parts of Iraq. They are working with the Iraqi people to bring stability to Iraq, and they are doing this because it is their duty and because they understand our enemy, what is at stake should we not succeed.

Right now, in households all across this country, there are families praying for the safe return of their loved ones. They understand the dangers. They know what is at stake. Unfortunately, in Washington, it would seem that too many politicians do not realize what is at stake, what the consequences are of failure. Instead, some propose we tell these soldiers and their families that Congress believes that the only choice is to close the door. They say retreat is our only option. Their desire is to adopt a policy of slow bleed, methodically squeezing off the necessary funding.

We all know our enemy is committed. We also know that this slow-bleed tactic, supported by some here in Washington, is a weakly disguised measure to turn our backs on our soldiers. That is something, Madam Speaker, that I cannot support.

SCOTT GARDNER ACT

(Mr. MCINTYRE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCINTYRE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to be speaking today about an extremely important piece of legislation that my good friend, Representative SUE MYRICK, and I are introducing. The Scott Gardner Act

strengthens our national immigration laws and preserves our public safety.

On July 16, 2005, 33-year-old husband and father, Scott Gardner, was killed by a drunk driver while his family was driving to the beach located in my congressional district. His wife was critically injured and his two children were robbed of their father for the rest of their lives. The drunk driver was a repeat offender and an illegal immigrant, an individual who should never have been in this country in the first place.

This tragedy was completely preventable, but our broken borders allowed an illegal immigrant with four prior drunk driving charges to remain in the United States. This situation must change so that we never lose another life to a criminal who doesn't deserve rightfully to be in our country.

This act, the Scott Gardner Act, would ensure that DWI is grounds for mandatory detention and deportation of illegal aliens. It would improve communications between Federal, State and local agencies. And it would allow those agencies and law enforcement to collect immigration information in the course of their normal duties.

FAMILY FARM PRESERVATION ACT

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, America has some of the most beautiful farmland in the world. But rapidly expanding urban sprawl is threatening this cherished natural resource every day. In fact, since 1960, approximately 1.5 million acres of American farmland have been converted to nonagricultural uses each year.

This week, I will introduce legislation aimed at slowing this trend that threatens family farms and our cherished open spaces. The Family Farm Preservation Act would encourage farmers to continue farming their land by exempting them from capital gains taxes when they sell their land development rights to qualified groups committed to conservation. Without protection from this significant tax burden, too many farmers are being forced to sell their land to developers, and that means fewer family farms and ever-shrinking open spaces.

By giving farmers an incentive to continue farming their land, this bill helps preserve the cherished way of life while protecting beautiful American landscapes at the same time. I hope all my colleagues will support the Family Farm Preservation Act.

PRESIDENT'S HOMELAND SECURITY BUDGET

(Mr. WALZ of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, in his second State of the

Union Address, President Bush stood in this very Chamber and told the Nation that the government would take unprecedented measures to protect our people and defend our homeland. As I stand here, almost 5 years after the creation of the Department of Homeland Security, the President has delivered a budget that will not keep that promise.

The President's proposed budget once again provides inadequate appropriations for Homeland Security. President Bush proposes slashing grants to our first responders. This will include massive cuts to both our firefighter grants and our State homeland security grants. It includes cuts to law enforcement and cuts to the Justice Department, and all of this while trying to fund tax cuts for the wealthiest among us.

Madam Speaker, this Democratic Congress remains focused on protecting this Nation from the real threat of global terrorism. Democrats are fighting for America's future. We will secure not only our homeland but our families, our jobs and our children's future.

HONDURAS MISSION

(Mr. GINGREY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recall the memory of three selfless and courageous Georgians, who tragically were killed in an accident last month while performing missionary work in rural Honduras.

Perry Goad and Ric Mason of Cartersville and Martha Fuller of Newnan were doing God's work on a church mission in the tiny village of Mal Pais. Together with a group of volunteers from several Georgia churches, they were working to set up running water, connect electricity, pave roads and improve life for the families living in Agalta Valley. It was during this effort that the group's truck rolled over on an undeveloped stretch of road, killing Perry, Ric and Martha.

Madam Speaker, these are three outstanding citizens who eagerly dedicated their time, their effort, their love and spirit to helping those in need. They were not content to simply sit in church and learn about the problems facing our world. They made an effort to go out and to fix these problems. And indeed, our community has truly lost three guiding lights.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in remembering the righteous lives of Perry Goad, Ric Mason and Martha Fuller and in offering prayers of healing to the other volunteers who were injured in the accident.

FALSE LINK BETWEEN AL QAEDA-IRAQ

(Mr. PASCRELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PASCRELL. It is not surprising to learn that during the Scooter Libby trial, Vice President CHENEY's former communications aide, Catherine Martin, said that delivering a message on Meet the Press was a tactic we often use. By the way, within the last 10 minutes, Mr. Libby has been found guilty on four of five counts.

The truth shall lead America. The truth is that the 9/11 Commission found no credible evidence of a link between Iraq and Al Qaeda and the attacks upon the United States. The epicenter of our war against terror is not Iraq but on the border of Pakistan and on the border of Afghanistan.

The American people deserve the truth instead of deceptive tactics. And if this administration won't give the people the truth about this war, then this Congress will.

He stated, Mr. CHENEY, five separate occasions that Saddam Hussein was joined at the hip with bin Laden. He told the American people five times a lie and repeated it year after year on the same TV station. The epicenter of our war on terror is on the border of Afghanistan and Pakistan.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members must refrain from engaging in personalities toward the Vice President.

WE MUST TAKE CARE OF OUR VETERANS

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, all of us in this Chamber agree, our recovering veterans deserve hospitals that are clean, secure and sanitary when they return home from the battlefield defending our great Nation in the name of liberty.

The recent findings at Walter Reed Army Medical Center are a grave breach of trust to those who shed blood on the battlefield fighting for our freedoms. This Congress must work with the administration to implement a comprehensive evaluation of conditions at Walter Reed and hold those in charge accountable for these deplorable conditions.

The bipartisan commission created by the President to determine whether similar problems exist at other military and VA hospitals is also a necessary and appropriate course of action. Going forward, we must ensure world-class standards and patient-centered efficiency for our veterans. Better oversight is clearly necessary to ensure military facilities exemplify our soldiers' honor and courage.

As hearings on the conditions at Walter Reed are held this week, this Congress must reaffirm its commitment to our wounded soldiers and veterans to ensure they are provided first class medical care.

WALTER REED SCANDAL

(Mr. COURTNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, the long-festering situation at Walter Reed's Building 18 is nothing short of a national scandal. I am pleased that the new 110th Congress is taking critical steps this week to investigate problems at the facility, and hold accountable leaders that allowed these conditions to deteriorate to this disgraceful state.

Last week, I met with veterans from my district to express deep concern about the lack of adequate transportation for veterans, the increasing length of time it takes for veterans to receive benefits or access health care and the stagnant funding of the VA system over the last 6 years. And they describe a system unable to cope with increasing patients at a time of war.

The challenges faced by these Connecticut veterans are emblematic of a military and VA health system swamped by the influx of wounded from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, and shortfalls of funding to adequately care for them caused by the misplaced priorities of the last Congress.

In the first days of this new Congress, we took an important step to address this problem by providing an additional \$3.6 billion for veterans health care, yet as my constituents related, there remain critical issues that need to be addressed as we move forward. The men and women who serve this country deserve nothing less than a health care system worthy of their service and sacrifice.

□ 1215

CALLING FOR RESOURCES, ATTENTION, AND ACCOUNTABILITY FROM GOVERNMENT

(Mr. SARBANES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Speaker, you cannot run America on the cheap.

In the wake of Katrina, we learned that years of requests for investment in infrastructure and basic human needs had been ignored. After sending our troops into Iraq, we learned that they lacked basic protective equipment because this administration was looking to save pennies even as it was wasting billions of dollars on private contracts run amok.

Now the scandal at Walter Reed Hospital is revealing that behind the curtain even our neediest veterans are not being spared the double whammy of inadequate resources and lax accountability.

All Americans should be outraged at this and demand accountability. But we should also be outraged at the cynical agenda this administration has brought to all government functions. Resources are cut, making it impossible for the affected workforce to deliver high-quality services. At the same

time, critical functions are contracted out to the private sector without adequate oversight. Then the administration turns around and says, see, government doesn't work.

Madam Speaker, it's time we reversed course and put adequate resources, attention, and accountability towards the needs of all our citizens but most especially our veterans.

PENTAGON SHOULD HAVE TAKEN ACTION EARLIER THAN THE RELEASE OF THE POST INVESTIGATION

(Mr. SPACE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SPACE. Madam Speaker, both high-ranking Pentagon officials and the White House have said that they were shocked to learn of the shoddy treatment wounded soldiers were receiving at Walter Reed. They say the first time they heard about this treatment was from The Washington Post investigation last month.

Madam Speaker, there is simply no way that the Bush administration did not know that this was a problem before the Post report. Several GAO reports have been conducted at the urging of Congress, and the findings of those reports back up exactly what we are now seeing at Walter Reed.

The Washington Post was also not the first media outlet to highlight this problem. Salon magazine reported on the mistreatment of soldiers at Walter Reed 2 years ago.

And yet the Bush administration continues to claim that it knew nothing about this until the Washington Post investigation last month. The administration is either completely out of touch or it simply does not believe taking care of our wounded military personnel is a top priority. Either way, it should be a top concern for this Congress and the American people.

BUSH ADMINISTRATION SHOULD NOT BE NICKEL-AND-DIMING AMERICA'S INJURED SOLDIERS

(Mr. SIREs asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIREs. Madam Speaker, The Washington Post headlines said it best: "Rotten Homecoming—This is no way to treat a veteran."

A 4-month Washington Post investigation found frustrating delays some of our returning soldiers are facing in receiving the compensation they are owed for the service to this Nation. One soldier was sent to Walter Reed after being smashed in the head by a steel cargo door of an 18-wheeler near the Iraqi border. Now the Pentagon is saying that the soldier's mental impairment comes from his being slow in high school, not from the dramatic head injury he suffered in combat.

Madam Speaker, this Congress has already begun investigating the out-

rageous problems our soldiers are facing at Walter Reed. President Bush cannot send them off to battle without properly caring for them when they return home.

CONGRESS MUST STOP FUNDING THE WAR

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, it appears that Congress, in the name of supporting the troops, will soon give President Bush the money he needs to continue the war in Iraq even though we don't take care of the troops when they come home.

If Congress funds the war, what will happen next? More troop casualties; more innocent civilians die; more destruction to Iraq; more destruction to our budget here at home; cuts in health care and education and job creation and housing and, yes, in veterans care.

Unless Congress cuts off funds and brings our troops home, we will be in Iraq for years to come. And for what?

I have introduced H.R. 1234, a bill to bring our troops home and stabilize Iraq.

Congress must take the first step and stop funding the war. Support the troops. Bring them home. Support H.R. 1234.

BUSH ADMINISTRATION NOT PROPERLY PLANNING TO CARE FOR WOUNDED MILITARY PERSONNEL

(Mr. ARCURI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, the treatment some of our wounded military personnel are receiving at Walter Reed Army Hospital and other facilities around the Nation is outrageous and should be fixed immediately.

The conditions and the neglect that many of these wounded soldiers are facing is just another example of this administration's failure to plan for the war in Iraq. It was bad enough that the administration went into this war without properly planning for the aftermath of the fall of Baghdad. It is inexcusable that the same administration does not have an acceptable plan to care for wounded soldiers who return from combat in Iraq.

We have all heard the stories about soldiers being moved into Building 18 with mold, mice, and cockroaches because Walter Reed had simply run out of space.

Time after time this administration has cut the Veterans Administration budget during a time of war. And now the President wants to send an additional 21,000 troops into Iraq. How can we think of sending more troops into Iraq when we don't have enough space here in our military hospitals to provide the wounded with the care they rightfully deserve?

We promise our veterans the quality care they need and deserve when they sign up to serve our country. It is time we make good on that promise.

WALTER REED HOSPITAL

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, at yesterday's hearing on Walter Reed, I asked the brass whether putting Walter Reed on the BRAC closure list had affected the hospital's staffing and stability. All responded that it had. Army Vice Chief of Staff Cody said, "We're trying to get the best people. Who would want to sign up to work at a hospital that might be closing?"

You don't close your premium military hospital in the middle of a shooting war and the war on terrorism. I can't imagine that Congress would spend \$3 billion on bricks and mortar that could go to wounded soldiers and to veterans. Yet as long as BRAC mandates closure, vital staff who value their careers get the closure signal.

This week I intend to file a bill to keep Walter Reed open. Too much harm has been done already. Let's not compound Walter Reed's problems by keeping a costly closure threat on the books.

SCHIP

(Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak about the immediate crisis in Georgia's PeachCare program.

Georgia's SCHIP program is expected to have \$131 million in shortfall this fiscal year. This shortfall has forced the Georgia Department of Community Health to announce that by March 11, in only 5 days, it will no longer accept new enrollees. This means that by next week nearly 300,000 children in Georgia will remain uninsured and unable to participate in this hugely successful program.

The leadership in the Georgia General Assembly seems to think that eliminating some children from the program will help resolve the PeachCare crisis. The Governor has so far not stated publicly that he will use available State money to sustain PeachCare during this shortfall crisis. And Congress, for its part, has been unable to act quickly enough to appropriate the funds that Georgia and the other 13 shortfall States need.

The Georgia General Assembly, the Governor, and the Congress must act immediately to save the PeachCare program. Georgia must continue to provide health care to children who are currently enrolled in the PeachCare program and to all of those children who are eligible for the program.

Long live the Dixie Chicks.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 5, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 2, 2007, at 12:30 pm:

That the Senate passed S. 743.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 47.

That the Senate agreed to S. Con Res. 16.

Appointments:

British-American Interparliamentary
Group

North Atlantic Treaty Organization Par-
liamentary Assembly

Canada-United States Interparliamentary
Group

Mexico-United States Interparliamentary
Group

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

HONORING THE LIFE AND
ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE LATE
DR. JOHN GARANG DE MABIOR

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 98) honoring the life and achievements of the late Dr. John Garang de Mabior and reaffirming the continued commitment of the House of Representatives to a just and lasting peace in the Republic of the Sudan, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 98

Whereas Dr. John Garang de Mabior, founder and leader of the Sudan People's Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/A), was born on June 23, 1945, in Bor, Sudan;

Whereas Dr. Garang joined the Anya-Nya Movement in 1970, a liberation movement in Southern Sudan, and after the 1972 Addis Ababa Peace Agreement, he became a member of the Sudanese Armed Forces;

Whereas as Deputy Director of the Military Research Branch of the Sudanese Armed Forces, Dr. Garang demonstrated his leadership abilities in the early stages of his military career;

Whereas Dr. Garang studied economics at Grinnell College and received his master of arts and doctorate degrees from Iowa State University;

Whereas Dr. Garang skillfully managed to consolidate his base after the devastating split in the SPLM/A in 1991;

Whereas as the undisputed leader of the SPLM/A, Dr. Garang demonstrated remarkable political and military leadership for over two decades;

Whereas Dr. Garang was a soldier, a scholar, a statesman, and a father, who had a clear vision and unwavering love for his people and country;

Whereas Dr. Garang fought for 22 years to achieve a just peace for his people, but only served 21 days as First Vice President of Sudan;

Whereas Dr. Garang fought not only for the people in Southern Sudan, but also for the forgotten and long marginalized people of the Nuba Mountains, Southern Blue Nile, Darfur, and other regions of the country;

Whereas Dr. Garang worked tirelessly to help build international support for a new Sudan that would be multi-ethnic, multi-religious, democratic, and united;

Whereas the new Sudan envisioned by Dr. Garang, if fully realized, would be a country in which all Sudanese would live in peace without discrimination and hatred, with equality, pride, and dignity;

Whereas Dr. Garang creatively and painstakingly managed the often conflicting aspirations of his people for an independent Southern Sudan and his vision for a new Sudan;

Whereas the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, which was signed by the Government of Sudan and the SPLM/A on January 9, 2005, provides Southern Sudan the right to self-determination through a referendum after six years and also offers the northern establishment in Sudan the opportunity to make unity attractive during the interim period;

Whereas on July 8, 2005, millions of people throughout Sudan came to show their support in Khartoum when Dr. Garang was sworn in as First Vice President of Sudan; and

Whereas on July 30, 2005, Dr. John Garang died in a helicopter crash returning to Southern Sudan from Uganda: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) honors the life and achievements of Dr. John Garang de Mabior;

(2) reaffirms its commitment to a just and lasting peace in the Republic of the Sudan;

(3) calls for full implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement without any delay;

(4) strongly urges the people of Southern Sudan and its leaders to continue to support Dr. Garang's vision for a new Sudan;

(5) strongly urges the full commitment of the United States, the United Nations, the European Union, the African Union, and the League of Arab States to support Dr. Garang's vision for a new Sudan by endorsing democratic elections throughout Sudan in 2009, as provided by the Comprehensive Peace Agreement;

(6) strongly supports the creation of a Dr. John Garang de Mabior Institute for Agriculture, Peace, and Economic Development in Southern Sudan; and

(7) directs the Clerk of the House of Representatives to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the Secretary of State with a request that the Secretary transmit it to Dr. Garang's widow, Rebecca Garang, and to the Government of Southern Sudan, through the Office of the Sudan People's Liberation Movement (SPLM) in the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and the gen-

tlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROSE-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of House Resolution 98.

Let me begin by thanking Chairman LANTOS for his leadership in the Foreign Affairs Committee, which allowed our resolution to come through the committee, and our ranking member. And I would like to also give special acknowledgment to Congressman FRANK WOLF, who for many, many years, even preceding my entrance to Congress, was working on issues dealing with the problem in Sudan. And he worked very closely with the late Dr. John Garang de Mabior to help bring about peace in southern Sudan.

Madam Speaker, H. Res. 98 honors the life and achievements of Dr. John Garang de Mabior and reaffirms the continued commitment of the House of Representatives to a just and lasting peace in Sudan. The resolution honors the life and achievements of Dr. Garang; reaffirms its commitment to a just and lasting peace in the Republic of Sudan; calls for the full implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement without delay; strongly urges the people of southern Sudan and its leaders to continue to support Dr. Garang's vision for a new Sudan; and strongly supports the creation of a Dr. John Garang de Mabior Institute for Agriculture, Peace, and Economic Development in southern Sudan.

Dr. Garang had a vision for a new Sudan, a Sudan which is multicultural, multi-ethnic, and peaceful. He fought for 21 years as the leader of the Sudanese People's Liberation Movement/Army to achieve a just peace for his people but only served 21 days as the first Vice President of Sudan before being killed in a tragic and mysterious helicopter crash on July 30, 2005, in his region of south Sudan where he was to be sworn in as President.

Dr. John, as he was affectionately called, was a powerful human being and a symbol of a people's freedom from oppression. Dr. John was born into a poor family of the Dinka ethnic group in the Upper Nile region of Sudan. He was orphaned by the age of 10 but supported by his family members. When the first civil war started in 1962, he was too young to fight and was sent away to school in Tanzania and later came to the U.S. to get his degree and studied at the University of California Berkeley but decided to go back.

□ 1230

The fact is that Dr. Garang was a person that we honor and respected so much, and he will live on in that country. But there was this tragic and mysterious crash on July 30, 2005, which took his life. At the time I was traveling the region in hopes of seeing Dr. Garang in Southern Sudan to discuss the status of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement. It was a terribly saddening situation when I received the news of his crash.

Besides leaving behind a wife and five children, he also was mourned by the people of all of Sudan, from east, west, the center, to the north as well as the south. They all saw him as their hope for future peace and justice in Sudan.

Thankfully, the number two member of the SPLM, Dr. Salva Kiir, was installed as the new first vice president of the government of Sudan and President of the government of South Sudan, and we are working to help professionalize the government of Southern Sudan and the SPLA. This is a critical time for real and lasting peace in Sudan.

We must support the government of Southern Sudan in development efforts and arrange for elections in 2 years. We also must ensure that the people of Southern Sudan get the right to self-determination through a referendum in 2011, as provided for in the Comprehensive Peace Agreement.

I have followed the crisis in Sudan for most of the last 21 years as the Islamic government in Khartoum waged war against the Sudanese People's Liberation Army/Movement and the people of the south. More than 4 million people were displaced from Southern Sudan, and over 2 million people were killed over the course of this 21 year war.

During that time, the National Islamist Front Government, led by Omar el Bashir, committed innumerable brutalities of unimaginable scope against the people of the South and the marginalized areas of Southern Blue Nile and Nuba Mountains. It was the longest running war in Africa until January 9, 2005, when the parties signed the Comprehensive Peace Agreement.

I was in Nairobi for the signing of the CPA and was cautiously hopeful that the long awaited peace in Sudan would work. However, once the north-south conflict reached a point where an agreement was imminent, the government began its attack on the innocent civilians in Darfur. With the help of the Janjaweed, the National Congress Party, formerly the National Islamic Front, had destroyed villages and communities, and maimed, raped, killed and terrorized the people of Darfur.

In the annual Country Report on Human Rights released today, the State Department called Darfur "the most sobering reality in 2006." Over 400,000 are dead; more than 2.5 million displaced.

The people of Sudan have suffered tremendously under the hands of this

government which, by the way, came to power in a bloody coup in 1989. This same government harbored Osama bin Laden for 5 years between 1991 and 1996. He plotted several terrorist attacks from there.

However, the Comprehensive Peace Agreement so many people have worked for has not been implemented fully, and the genocide in Darfur is not abating. We must be firm with Khartoum. Khartoum must comply with the CPA. Khartoum must stop the killings in Darfur.

I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this resolution.

I also want to take the opportunity on the floor of the House of Representatives to congratulate Ghana on 50 years of independence from Britain. Today, people from all over Ghana and all over the world and many heads of state are celebrating the first Sub-Saharan country to gain its independence 50 years ago. So the correlation between the new Southern Sudan and what happened 50 years ago in Ghana is very important.

Let us remember that Ghana's first leader, Kwame Nkrumah, had a broad vision of African unity. President Nkrumah did not make a distinction between north and south. He called it one continent. His belief is in one Africa, one of the underpinnings for African unity.

So Africa certainly has a long way to go, but the continent as a whole is more stable today than it was many years ago, and with better governance and use of resources, as well as fairer trade policies by the U.S. and other Western countries, African countries can grow and develop into one of the most important areas in the world.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman PAYNE for his words. I am also pleased to support House Resolution 98, highlighting the life and achievements of the late John Garang and reaffirming the commitment of the House to a just and lasting peace in Sudan.

While much attention is currently focused on the crisis in Darfur and that region of western Sudan, it is critical that we do not allow ourselves to become complacent in the south. After all, it was in the south that over 20 years of war between the government in Khartoum and the Sudan People's Liberation Army left over 2 million people dead and 4 million others displaced. It was in the south that the government of Sudan honed its craft in genocide, manipulating ethnic tensions, arming proxy militias, conducting aerial bombardments of civilians and engaging in forced displacement, mass murder, looting, torture and rape. It was also in the south that a generation of boys was lost, having been forcibly conscripted to serve as child soldiers for the Armed Forces of

Sudan, associated militias and the Sudan People's Liberation Army.

Any analyst will tell you that war is a terrible business, and the war in Southern Sudan was no exception. There were no saints. That said, it is clear that without the leadership of Dr. Garang, it is likely that the oppressors would have succeeded and that the opportunity for peace presented by the conclusion of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement for Sudan in 2005 would have been lost.

Dr. Garang envisioned a united democratic Sudan, a country in which all citizens enjoyed the freedom to live, to worship and to prosper without the fear of discrimination or persecution. If realized, this dream would proffer untold benefits, not only for the people of the south, but also for those fighting inequality in eastern Sudan and Darfur. He fought fiercely toward this end and succeeded in overcoming seemingly insurmountable challenges so that the south could negotiate with one voice.

After years of negotiations and countless failed attempts, it appeared that Dr. Garang's efforts would finally pay off in January of 2005 as the historic peace agreement which would end Africa's longest running civil war was signed in Nairobi, Kenya. His tragic death on July 30, 2005 proved to be the first major test of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement for Sudan. Unfortunately, it would not be the last.

It is critical that the United States Government not lose sight of the challenges that remain in implementation. Too many innocents have died. It is time for all Sudanese to pursue the path toward peace and it is incumbent upon us to help them on their way.

I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 98. I rise to honor the life and achievements of the late Dr. John Garang de Mabior. I rise to reaffirm the continued commitment of the House of Representatives to a just and lasting peace in the Republic of the Sudan.

Let me express my thanks to Mr. PAYNE and Mr. WOLF, the chair and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, respectively. I also wish to express my appreciation to the many other co-sponsors of this resolution who have worked long and hard to help bring about a just and lasting peace in Southern Sudan.

Madam Speaker, the life of Dr. John Garang de Mabior, "Dr. John," as he was affectionately called, is testimony to mankind's innate capacity to do good and a powerful symbol of a peoples' struggle for freedom. In honoring Dr. John today, we also keep alive the dreams of his people. One day peace and justice will flow like milk and honey for all people throughout Southern Sudan.

Dr. John was born into a poor family of the Dinka ethnic group, in the Upper Nile Region of Sudan. He was orphaned by the age of 10 but was supported by his family members. It truly took a village to raise a child and what a child he was!

When the civil war broke out in 1962, Dr. John was too young to fight and was sent away to high school in Tanzania. In 1969, he earned a scholarship attend Grinnell College in Iowa. After graduation he could have attended graduate school at the University of California at Berkeley but turned it down, choosing instead, to return to Tanzania to study agricultural economics where he could be closer to his people.

In 1972, Dr. John joined the Sudanese military and became a career soldier. He eventually took a leave and earned his doctorate in agricultural economics from the University of Iowa. But a life of academic repose was not for Dr. John for he was a man of action and passion. And the actions and passions of his time called him to a life of struggle on behalf of the oppressed people of his country.

In 1983, Dr. John left the military and joined the newly created Sudanese Peoples' Liberation Army, a movement opposed to the imposition of Sharia law. Thus began his long career as the political and military leader of the people of Southern Sudan.

Throughout this struggle, Dr. John developed a strong political and personal relationship with many Members of the House of Representatives.

The struggle for justice in Sudan was not a partisan issue for Members of Congress. Strong bonds of collegiality and friendship were formed through our efforts to shape U.S. foreign policy toward Sudan.

In that sense, Dr. John's life and struggle, and the struggle of the Southern Sudanese people served to unite Democrats and Republicans in a common cause for freedom.

When I first met with Dr. John in my congressional office, I recall he did not waste words. In his soft-spoken way, he laid out very clearly his vision for Southern Sudan. And, in his highly dignified way, this powerfully charismatic man of deep conviction and strong moral character asked for my support and the support of the United States Congress on behalf of his people. It was clear to me then, as it is now, that Dr. John lived a purposeful life of singular devotion to the liberation and well-being of his people.

Dr. John's tragic death in the mountains of Uganda shocked the world. It seems enormously unjust for this man, who brought his people through a long and devastating civil war, who became Vice President of Sudan, and who later became head of Southern Sudan, to die in 2005 in a helicopter crash.

Madam Speaker, out of this historic tragedy, the people of Southern Sudan have been called to carry on. As Dr. John said after being inaugurated: "I congratulate the Sudanese people. This is not my peace or the peace of al-Bashir; it is the peace of the Sudanese people."

Madam Speaker, the recognition this House today gives Dr. John Garang de Mabior should also remind us of the importance of redoubling our resolve to end the genocide in Darfur. There is wide-spread and broad-based consensus in America and between Democrats and Republicans that the ongoing genocide in Darfur is intolerable and must be ended. Thus, this is an area in which there is ample opportunity for the Congress and the Bush administration to find common ground to alleviate the overwhelming suffering in Darfur.

Not since the Rwandan genocide of 1994 has the world seen such a systematic cam-

paign of displacement, starvation, rape, mass murder, and terror as we are witnessing in Darfur for the last 3 years. At least 400,000 people have been killed; more than 2 million innocent civilians have been forced to flee their homes and now live in displaced-persons camps in Sudan or in refugee camps in neighboring Chad; and more than 3.5 million men, women, and children are completely reliant on international aid for survival. Unless the world stirs from its slumber and takes concerted and decisive action to relieve this suffering, the ongoing genocide in Darfur will stand as one of the blackest marks on humankind for centuries to come. The people of Darfur cannot wait. The time has come for decisive leadership from the United States.

It has been more than 2 years since I and my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus Darfur Task Force met with Secretary Colin Powell to press successfully for the administration to declare that the campaign of ethnic cleansing and atrocities carried out against civilians primarily by the Government of Sudan and its allied Janjaweed militias is genocide.

It has been more than a year since I flew to Chad and walked across the border to Sudan and met with African Union troops who pleaded for more peacekeeping authority and the resources to protect the refugees from violence, rather than merely monitor it. After returning from that Congressional delegation, I worked with other Members of Congress to secure increased funding to aid the thousands of Sudanese displaced to refugee camps in Chad and to provide additional funding to assist Chad in responding to the humanitarian crisis.

It has been almost 2 years since the UN Security Council adopted Resolution 1556 demanding that the government of Sudan disarm the Janjaweed. This demand was later followed by Resolution 1706, which authorizes a 20,000 strong U.N. peacekeeping force.

It has been 6 months since the Darfur Peace Agreement was brokered in May 2006 between the Government of Sudan and one faction of Darfur rebels.

But still the violence continues; indeed, the violence is escalating. This violence is making it even more dangerous, if not impossible, for most of the millions of displaced persons to return to their homes and for humanitarian relief agencies to bring food and medical aid. According to Jan Egeland, the U.N.'s top humanitarian official, the situation in Darfur is "going from real bad to catastrophic."

We have come full circle. Violence is increasing, peace treaties are falling apart, and again as a member of the Congressional Black Caucus Darfur Taskforce and a ranking member on the House Judiciary immigration subcommittee, I have been meeting with Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice seeking an increase in the number of refugee visas for Darfur students to come to the United States to study. I will continue my ongoing, unceasing efforts to end the suffering in Darfur and bring peace to Sudan. These efforts include intensifying my discussions with Secretary Rice, the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, representatives of the Arab League, and humanitarian groups such as Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, and various African public policy groups to discuss ways and means of bringing peace to that troubled land.

It is also not too early to begin the hard thinking and hard work needed to transform the Darfur region from killing field to economically, politically, and socially viable and peaceful community. This work will, of course, require the active and purposeful engagement of the United States and other key stakeholders, such as China, and the Arab League. In this connection, I have been engaged in an ongoing dialogue with government representatives of Egypt, a dialogue that has already yielded significant dividends. For example, Egypt has implemented several fast track projects in southern Sudan in different sectors involving health, agriculture, electricity, irrigation, infrastructure, and education in order to make unity an even more attractive option to the people of south Sudan.

It must be noted that no just and lasting peace in Sudan can be achieved without the responsible intervention of China. For too long China, which is Sudan's biggest oil customer, has also served as Khartoum's enabler and protector by preventing the U.N. Security Council from imposing more serious sanctions on Sudan in response to the genocide and crimes against humanity committed in Darfur. As former Deputy Secretary of State Robert Zoellick stated in a major policy speech on China a year ago: "China should take more than oil from Sudan—it should take some responsibility for resolving Sudan's human crisis." Based on my meetings with Zhou Wenzhong, China's ambassador to the United States, I am hopeful that China can be persuaded to provide the type of constructive leadership in Sudan befitting a great power.

There is much work to be done and not much time, Madam Speaker. And I have no doubt that our response will be worthy of our responsibility as a world leader. But today, it is right and good and just to pause, reflect, and honor the remarkable life of a remarkable human being—Dr. John Garang de Mabior, which we will do by adopting H. Res. 98.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting the resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 98, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

NATO FREEDOM CONSOLIDATION ACT OF 2007

Mr. TANNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the

bill (H.R. 987) to endorse further enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and to facilitate the timely admission of new members to NATO, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 987

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “NATO Freedom Consolidation Act of 2007”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The sustained commitment of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to mutual defense has made possible the democratic transformation of Central and Eastern Europe. Members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization can and should play a critical role in addressing the security challenges of the post-Cold War era in creating the stable environment needed for those emerging democracies in Europe.

(2) Lasting stability and security in Europe requires the military, economic, and political integration of emerging democracies into existing European structures.

(3) In an era of threats from terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is increasingly contributing to security in the face of global security challenges for the protection and interests of its member states.

(4) In the NATO Participation Act of 1994 (title II of Public Law 103-447; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), Congress declared that “full and active participants in the Partnership for Peace in a position to further the principles of the North Atlantic Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area should be invited to become full NATO members in accordance with Article 10 of such Treaty at an early date . . .”.

(5) In the NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act of 1996 (title VI of section 101(c) of title I of division A of Public Law 104-208; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), Congress called for the prompt admission of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovenia to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and declared that “in order to promote economic stability and security in Slovakia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Bulgaria, Albania, Moldova, and Ukraine . . . the process of enlarging NATO to include emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe should not be limited to consideration of admitting Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovenia as full members of the NATO Alliance”.

(6) In the European Security Act of 1998 (title XXVII of division G of Public Law 105-277; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), Congress declared that “Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic should not be the last emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe invited to join NATO” and that “Romania, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Bulgaria . . . would make an outstanding contribution to furthering the goals of NATO and enhancing stability, freedom, and peace in Europe should they become NATO members [and] upon complete satisfaction of all relevant criteria should be invited to become full NATO members at the earliest possible date”.

(7) In the Gerald B. H. Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-187; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), Congress endorsed “... the vision of further enlargement of the NATO Alliance articulated by President George W. Bush on June 15, 2001, and by former President William J. Clinton on October 22, 1996”.

(8) At the Madrid Summit of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in July 1997, Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic were invited to join the Alliance, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization heads of state and government issued a declaration stating “[t]he alliance expects to extend further invitations in coming years to nations willing and able to assume the responsibilities and obligations of membership . . . [n]o European democratic country whose admission would fulfill the objectives of the [North Atlantic] Treaty will be excluded from consideration”.

(9) At the Washington Summit of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in April 1999, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization heads of state and government issued a communiqué declaring “[w]e pledge that NATO will continue to welcome new members in a position to further the principles of the [North Atlantic] Treaty and contribute to peace and security in the Euro-Atlantic area . . . [t]he three new members will not be the last . . . [n]o European democratic country whose admission would fulfill the objectives of the Treaty will be excluded from consideration, regardless of its geographic location . . .”.

(10) In May 2000 in Vilnius, Lithuania, the foreign ministers of Albania, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, the Republic of Macedonia, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia issued a statement (later joined by Croatia) declaring that—

(A) their countries will cooperate in jointly seeking membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in the next round of enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization;

(B) the realization of membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization by one or more of these countries would be a success for all; and

(C) eventual membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization for all of these countries would be a success for Europe and for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

(11) On June 15, 2001, in a speech in Warsaw, Poland, President George W. Bush stated “[a]ll of Europe’s new democracies, from the Baltic to the Black Sea and all that lie between, should have the same chance for security and freedom—and the same chance to join the institutions of Europe—as Europe’s old democracies have . . . I believe in NATO membership for all of Europe’s democracies that seek it and are ready to share the responsibilities that NATO brings . . . [a]s we plan to enlarge NATO, no nation should be used as a pawn in the agenda of others . . . [w]e will not trade away the fate of free European peoples . . . [n]o more Munichs . . . [n]o more Yaltas . . . [a]s we plan the Prague Summit, we should not calculate how little we can get away with, but how much we can do to advance the cause of freedom”.

(12) On October 22, 1996, in a speech in Detroit, Michigan, former President William J. Clinton stated “NATO’s doors will not close behind its first new members . . . NATO should remain open to all of Europe’s emerging democracies who are ready to shoulder the responsibilities of membership . . . [n]o nation will be automatically excluded . . . [n]o country outside NATO will have a veto . . . [a] gray zone of insecurity must not re-emerge in Europe”.

(13) At the Prague Summit of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in November 2002, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia were invited to join the Alliance in the second round of enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization since the end of the Cold War, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization heads of state and government issued a declaration stating “NATO’s door will remain open to European democracies

willing and able to assume the responsibilities and obligations of membership, in accordance with Article 10 of the Washington Treaty”.

(14) On May 8, 2003, the United States Senate unanimously approved the Resolution of Ratification to Accompany Treaty Document No. 108-4, Protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on Accession of Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia, inviting Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia to join the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

(15) At the Istanbul Summit of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in June 2004, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization heads of state and government issued a communiqué reaffirming that NATO’s door remains open to new members, declaring “[w]e celebrate the success of NATO’s Open Door Policy, and reaffirm today that our seven new members will not be the last. The door to membership remains open. We welcome the progress made by Albania, Croatia, and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (1) in implementing their Annual National Programmes under the Membership Action Plan, and encourage them to continue pursuing the reforms necessary to progress toward NATO membership. We also commend their contribution to regional stability and cooperation. We want all three countries to succeed and will continue to assist them in their reform efforts. NATO will continue to assess each country’s candidacy individually, based on the progress made towards reform goals pursued through the Membership Action Plan, which will remain the vehicle to keep the readiness of each aspirant for membership under review. We direct that NATO Foreign Ministers keep the enlargement process, including the implementation of the Membership Action Plan, under continual review and report to us. We will review at the next Summit progress by aspirants towards membership based on that report”.

(16) Georgia and Ukraine have stated their desire to join the Euro-Atlantic community, and in particular, are seeking to join the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Georgia and Ukraine are working closely with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and its members to meet criteria for eventual membership in NATO.

(17) At a press conference with President Mikhail Saakashvili of Georgia in Washington, DC on July 5, 2006, President George W. Bush stated that “... I believe that NATO would benefit with Georgia being a member of NATO, and I think Georgia would benefit. And there’s a way forward through the Membership Action Plan . . . And I’m a believer in the expansion of NATO. I think it’s in the world’s interest that we expand NATO”.

(18) Following a meeting of NATO Foreign Ministers in New York on September 21, 2006, NATO Secretary General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer announced the launching of an Intensified Dialogue on membership between the Alliance and Georgia.

(19) At the NATO-Ukraine Commission Summit in Brussels in February 2005, President of Ukraine Victor Yushchenko declared membership in NATO as the ultimate goal of Ukraine’s cooperation with the Alliance and expressed Ukraine’s desire to conclude a Membership Action Plan.

(20) At the NATO-Ukraine Commission Foreign Ministerial meeting in Vilnius in April 2005, NATO and Ukraine launched an Intensified Dialogue on the potential membership of Ukraine in NATO.

(21) At the Riga Summit of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in November 2006, the Heads of State and Government of the

member countries of NATO issued a declaration reaffirming that NATO's door remains open to new members, declaring that "all European democratic countries may be considered for MAP (Membership Action Plan) or admission, subject to decision by the NAC (North Atlantic Council) at each stage, based on the performance of these countries towards meeting the objectives of the North Atlantic Treaty. We direct that NATO Foreign Ministers keep that process under continual review and report to us. We welcome the efforts of Albania, Croatia, and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to prepare themselves for the responsibilities and obligations of membership. We reaffirm that the Alliance will continue with Georgia and Ukraine its Intensified Dialogues which cover the full range of political, military, financial and security issues relating to those countries' aspirations to membership, without prejudice to any eventual Alliance decision. We reaffirm the importance of the NATO-Ukraine Distinctive Partnership, which has its 10th anniversary next year and welcome the progress that has been made in the framework of our Intensified Dialogue. We appreciate Ukraine's substantial contributions to our common security, including through participation in NATO-led operations and efforts to promote regional co-operation. We encourage Ukraine to continue to contribute to regional security. We are determined to continue to assist, through practical cooperation, in the implementation of far-reaching reform efforts, notably in the fields of national security, defence, reform of the defence-industrial sector and fighting corruption. We welcome the commencement of an Intensified Dialogue with Georgia as well as Georgia's contribution to international peacekeeping and security operations. We will continue to engage actively with Georgia in support of its reform process. We encourage Georgia to continue progress on political, economic and military reforms, including strengthening judicial reform, as well as the peaceful resolution of outstanding conflicts on its territory. We reaffirm that it is of great importance that all parties in the region should engage constructively to promote regional peace and stability."

(22) Contingent upon their continued implementation of democratic, defense, and economic reform, and their willingness and ability to meet the responsibilities of membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and a clear expression of national intent to do so, Congress calls for the timely admission of Albania, Croatia, Georgia, Macedonia, and Ukraine to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to promote security and stability in Europe.

SEC. 3. DECLARATIONS OF POLICY.

Congress—

(1) reaffirms its previous expressions of support for continued enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization contained in the NATO Participation Act of 1994, the NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act of 1996, the European Security Act of 1998, and the Gerald B. H. Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act of 2002;

(2) supports the commitment to further enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to include European democracies that are able and willing to meet the responsibilities of Membership, as expressed by the Alliance in its Madrid Summit Declaration of 1997, its Washington Summit Communiqué of 1999, its Prague Summit Declaration of 2002, its Istanbul Summit Communiqué of 2004, and its Riga Summit Declaration of 2006; and

(3) endorses the vision of further enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization

articulated by President George W. Bush on June 15, 2001, and by former President William J. Clinton on October 22, 1996, and urges our allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to work with the United States to realize a role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in promoting global security, including continued support for enlargement to include qualified candidate states, specifically by entering into a Membership Action Plan with Georgia and recognizing the progress toward meeting the responsibilities and obligations of NATO membership by Albania, Croatia, Georgia, Macedonia, and Ukraine.

SEC. 4. DESIGNATION OF ALBANIA, CROATIA, GEORGIA, MACEDONIA, AND UKRAINE AS ELIGIBLE TO RECEIVE ASSISTANCE UNDER THE NATO PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1994.

(a) DESIGNATION.—

(1) ALBANIA.—The Republic of Albania is designated as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994 (title II of Public Law 103-447; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), and shall be deemed to have been so designated pursuant to section 203(d)(1) of such Act.

(2) CROATIA.—The Republic of Croatia is designated as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994, and shall be deemed to have been so designated pursuant to section 203(d)(1) of such Act.

(3) GEORGIA.—Georgia is designated as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994, and shall be deemed to have been so designated pursuant to section 203(d)(1) of such Act.

(4) MACEDONIA.—The Republic of Macedonia is designated as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994, and shall be deemed to have been so designated pursuant to section 203(d)(1) of such Act.

(5) UKRAINE.—Ukraine is designated as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994, and shall be deemed to have been so designated pursuant to section 203(d)(1) of such Act.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The designation of the Republic of Albania, the Republic of Croatia, Georgia, the Republic of Macedonia, and Ukraine pursuant to subsection (a) as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994—

(1) is in addition to the designation of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovenia pursuant to section 606 of the NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act of 1996 (title VI of section 101(c) of title I of division A of Public Law 104-208; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), the designation of Romania, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Bulgaria pursuant to section 2703(b) of the European Security Act of 1998 (title XXVII of division G of Public Law 105-277; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), and the designation of Slovakia pursuant to section 4(a) of the Gerald B. H. Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-187; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note) as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994; and

(2) shall not preclude the designation by the President of other countries pursuant to section 203(d)(2) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994 as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of such Act.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF SECURITY ASSISTANCE FOR COUNTRIES DESIGNATED UNDER THE NATO PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1994.

Of the amounts made available for fiscal year 2008 under section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2763) such sums as may be necessary are authorized to be appropriated for assistance to the Republic of Albania, the Republic of Croatia, Georgia, the Republic of Macedonia, and Ukraine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROSELEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TANNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. TANNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank Chairman LANTOS and my good friend, Representative PAUL GILLMOR from Ohio, for helping with this bill, and also the ranking member on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

NATO is probably arguably one of the most important organizations now in this post-cold war period. NATO, our allies in Europe and Canada, have presently almost 17,000 troops on the ground in Kosovo and 35,000 in Afghanistan. The alliance is strong, and it is very important from the standpoint of being an international organization that can go anywhere and bring order to chaos and back it up with some military capability. That is unique and critical, in my judgment, in this post-Cold War world.

NATO itself symbolizes really the cooperative effort across the Atlantic to promote regional and area-wide stability and also to encourage fledgling democracies, particularly in Eastern Europe. This legislation before us recognizes the continuing efforts of Albania, Croatia, Georgia, Macedonia and Ukraine to become members of NATO and encourages them to continue on that path. It is a statement from the Congress that we believe that what they are doing is important, and we believe that they are moving in the right direction.

Since 1989, 10 countries have joined NATO. We have seen Eastern European countries join NATO and make a remarkable contribution to the ongoing effort not only in Afghanistan and in the Balkans, but also as it relates to the furthering of democracy across some of those formerly Warsaw Pact countries. Every President has endorsed the efforts that are embodied in this bill in terms of the expansion of NATO, and this process is not yet complete.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for recognizing the great work that both Chairman LANTOS as well as Congressman GILLMOR of Ohio have done in paying attention to this issue of NATO.

Madam Speaker, I am so pleased to support this very timely legislation. This measure is a further step in helping to ensure that NATO, its member states and those aspiring to join this alliance are united in pursuit of European democracy and security.

Since its formation in 1949, NATO's mission has been to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of its members by promoting stability and well-being in the North Atlantic area.

□ 1245

The measure before us serves to express America's continued support for these important goals.

The NATO Freedom Consolidation Act should help to nurture all those European states that may eventually join that alliance and give it a sense of common strategic peacekeeping goals, by encouraging them to prepare, assume and maintain the responsibilities of membership.

Specifically, the legislation calls for the timely admission of Albania, Croatia, Georgia, Macedonia, and Ukraine to NATO and authorizes security assistance for these countries in fiscal year 2008. The standards for joining NATO should not be lowered in any way and each country should be evaluated individually on the merits.

Albania, Croatia, and Macedonia have been making progress on reforms through their participation in the NATO Membership Action Plan since 2002.

Georgia and Ukraine have not yet been granted a Membership Action Plan, but these two nations are making strides in order to qualify for MAP.

The NATO Freedom Consolidation Act will provide important incentives and assistance to the countries to continue the implementation of democratic, defense and economic reforms. In these times, Madam Speaker, when we have important missions to accomplish overseas, I encourage my colleagues to vote in support of this measure.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to Mr. GILLMOR, who just returned from a NATO conference overseas.

Mr. GILLMOR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and also for her support of this resolution. I am very pleased to join with my colleague, JOHN TANNER, in supporting this resolution.

NATO is our most successful military alliance, maybe the most successful military alliance in history. It won the

Cold War, and it is also providing security now in many other areas of the world that are outside the exact geographical footprint of the NATO countries. For example, as Mr. TANNER pointed out, there are troops in the Balkans. There are NATO troops in Afghanistan where they are carrying the fight. Many of those NATO allies have had troops also in Iraq.

Very shortly after NATO was created in 1949, there was another group called the NATO Parliamentary Assembly to keep a close liaison between the North Atlantic Council, which is NATO, and the parliaments of those countries. Mr. TANNER and I have had the opportunity to represent the United States on that organization for I think a little over 10 years, and it has been a very valuable organization from the point of view of the United States. We have both had the opportunity at different times to serve as vice president of it and as chairman of the Economic and Security Committee, and Mr. TANNER now leads our delegation to that group.

One of the things that I think is important about that when we go, as Republicans and Democrats, we seem to quit being Republicans and Democrats when we get outside of the United States. I would say when we meet with our European allies, the only way they know which party we belong to is when they ask us, because we speak with one voice.

But many of the nations on the other side of the Cold War east of the Iron Curtain are now members of NATO, and they are some of the strongest and most enthusiastic members. As recently as 2004, seven new countries were added, all of them Warsaw countries, bringing the NATO membership to 26: Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia.

I want to point out that NATO is not a club you just join. You have to earn membership in NATO. It is a military alliance. You have to meet the criteria, and you have to contribute your part to that military strength in order to be a member. As long as the new members meet those commitments, NATO will continue to be a strong alliance and one of the strongest forces for peace, stability, and democracy in the world.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TANNER. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize a member of our delegation to the NATO PA; and by the way, Mr. GILLMOR is a vice president of the NATO PA this term, and I am proud to serve with him, and now I would like to recognize a member of our delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), and yield to her such time as she may consume.

Mrs. EMERSON. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 987.

I want to tell a little story, if that is all right. Back in 1968 when I was 17 years old and a senior in high school, my high school actually organized a

spring break Eastertime trip to the Soviet Union, to Czechoslovakia, to Poland, and to East Berlin. It was my first trip out of the country; it was my first trip on an airplane; and of all places to go, it was behind the Iron Curtain.

I knew a lot about NATO back then simply because we were studying it in my civics class, but I really didn't understand the importance of NATO until I went on that trip; and I didn't understand what it all meant until I went with my colleagues to my very first NATO Parliamentary Assembly meeting a few years ago.

When you went to visit countries behind the Iron Curtain back when communism was rampant, it was remarkable to go into these countries where you had no freedom, no expression of thought, no nothing. It was gray and it was dreary, and it was so sad. Even though we were able to spend, at least in Czechoslovakia, time with some students, you really understood the importance of protecting your civil rights and your freedom of speech. I really understood that for the first time because of course we were all as kids afraid that we were being bugged in our hotel rooms and we were afraid to say anything because we thought we would get taken by the police.

Anyway, back to my first NATO meeting and we are sitting across the table from members of the Czech Republic, from Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, countries that had always been under the iron thumb of communism and the Soviet Union, and with the fall of the Berlin Wall, of course, were able to come into their own once again. That is one of the most remarkable things about getting to know our fellow parliamentarians and understanding their great desire to join an alliance like NATO that has done really an amazing job in protecting the North Atlantic region and our allies throughout that particular area.

I don't know that people really understand the importance of this treaty organization and how it has fostered security and cooperation for almost 60 years now.

I know, though, that the work of NATO is not complete because we have newly democratic countries such as Georgia and the Ukraine who have expressed strong interest in joining NATO, as well as other countries like Croatia and Macedonia who have actually opened constructive dialogues on their potential for NATO membership.

When you have lived or touched on what it is like to live in countries that had no freedoms or protections like NATO can offer, it is so important for us to look favorably upon their opportunity to join this important treaty organization.

There is no doubt in my mind that NATO membership will be able to further our goal of extending democracy throughout the globe. Certainly H.R. 987 will help accomplish this goal, and I am very pleased that my colleague,

Mr. TANNER, has offered this bill; and I look forward to its passage.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I thank Mr. TANNER for his leadership.

Mr. TANNER. Madam Speaker, I want to thank Mrs. EMERSON and Mr. GILLMOR, and you, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for participating. This is an important bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 987.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS OF INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 149) supporting the goals of International Women's Day.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 149

Whereas there are over 3,000,000,000 women in the world, representing 51 percent of the world's population;

Whereas women continue to play the prominent role in caring for families within the home as well as serving as economic earners;

Whereas women worldwide are participating in the world of diplomacy and politics, contributing to the growth of economies, and improving the quality of the lives of their families, communities, and nations;

Whereas women leaders have recently made significant strides, including the 2007 election of Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi as the first female Speaker of the House of Representatives, the 2006 election of Michelle Bachelet as the first female President of Chile, the 2006 election of Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf as the first female President in Africa's history, and the 2005 election of Angela Merkel as the first female Chancellor of Germany, who will also serve as the second woman to chair a G8 summit beginning in 2007;

Whereas women account for 80 percent of the world's 70 million micro-borrowers, 75 percent of the 28,000 United States loans supporting small businesses in Afghanistan are made to women, and 11 women are chief executive officers of Fortune 500 companies;

Whereas in the United States, women are graduating from high school at higher rates and are earning bachelors degrees or higher degrees at greater rates than men, with 88 percent of women between the ages of 25 and 29 having obtained a high school diploma and 31 percent of women between the ages of 25 and 29 earning a bachelors degree or higher;

Whereas despite tremendous gains, women still face political and economic obstacles, struggle for basic rights, face the threat of discrimination, and are targets of violence all over the world;

Whereas worldwide women remain vastly underrepresented in national and local assemblies, accounting on average for less than 10 percent of the seats in parliament, except

for in East Asia where the figure is approximately 18 to 19 percent, and in no developing region do women hold more than 8 percent of the ministerial positions;

Whereas women work two-thirds of the world's working hours and produce half of the world's food, yet earn only 1 percent of the world's income and own less than 1 percent of the world's property;

Whereas in the United States between 1995 and 2000, female managers earned less than their male counterparts in the 10 industries that employ the vast majority of all female employees;

Whereas of the 1,300,000,000 people living in poverty around the world, 70 percent are women and children;

Whereas according to the United States Agency for International Development, two-thirds of the 876,000,000 illiterate individuals worldwide are women, two-thirds of the 125,000,000 school-aged children who are not attending school worldwide are girls, and girls are less likely to complete school than boys;

Whereas worldwide women account for half of all cases of HIV/AIDS, approximately 42,000,000 cases, and in countries with high HIV prevalence, young women are at a higher risk than young men of contracting HIV;

Whereas globally, each year over 500,000 women die during childbirth and pregnancy;

Whereas domestic violence causes more deaths and disability among women between ages 15 and 44 than cancer, malaria, traffic accidents, and war;

Whereas worldwide, at least 1 out of every 3 women and girls has been beaten in her lifetime;

Whereas according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, at least 1 out of every 6 women and girls in the United States has been sexually abused in her lifetime;

Whereas worldwide, 130,000,000 girls and young women have been subjected to female genital mutilation and it is estimated that 10,000 girls are at risk of being subjected to this practice in the United States;

Whereas according to the Congressional Research Service and the Department of State, illegal trafficking in women and children for forced labor, domestic servitude, or sexual exploitation involves between 1,000,000 and 2,000,000 women and children each year, of whom 50,000 are transported into the United States;

Whereas between 75 and 80 percent of the world's 27,000,000 refugees are women and children;

Whereas in times and places of conflict and war, women and girls continue to be the focus of extreme violence and intimidation and face tremendous obstacles to legal recourse and justice;

Whereas March 8 has become known as International Women's Day for the last century, and is a day on which people, often divided by ethnicity, language, culture, and income, come together to celebrate a common struggle for women's equality, justice, and peace; and

Whereas the people of the United States should be encouraged to participate in International Women's Day: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals of International Women's Day;

(2) recognizes and honors the women in the United States and in other countries who have fought and continue to struggle for equality in the face of adversity;

(3) reaffirms its commitment to ending discrimination and violence against women and girls, to ensuring the safety and welfare of women and girls, and to pursuing policies that guarantee the basic human rights of

women and girls both in the United States and in other countries; and

(4) encourages the President to—

(A) reaffirm his commitment to pursue policies to protect fundamental human rights and civil liberties, particularly those of women and girls; and

(B) issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe International Women's Day with appropriate programs and activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and I first want to thank the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) and the other cosponsors of this resolution for recognizing International Women's Day in honor of the contributions and achievements of women all over the world and the importance of promoting and protecting their rights.

I want to pay special tribute today to my distinguished female colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who are performing their important responsibilities with distinction and honor. I also want to recognize my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), who has achieved the distinction of becoming the first woman to obtain the ranking position on this committee.

Today, women all over the world are becoming leaders in science, medicine, the arts, politics, business, and even the military.

Despite this progress, women and girls continue to represent the majority of the poor, the chronically hungry, refugees, the HIV-infected, the sick, the uneducated and the undereducated, the unemployed and disenfranchised people.

Women are also subject to specific forms of physical and structural violence and discrimination because of their gender. These include sexual violence in both conflict and nonconflict situations, sex trafficking, and domestic violence from their partners and family members.

Cruel cultural practices targeted at women include denial of voting rights, freedom of movement, and property rights. Women are also subjected to genital mutilation, forced and early marriages, humiliating and harmful

widow practices, bride burnings and honor killings. Women also continue to experience an unequal remuneration for work of equal value, discrimination in hiring and admission to educational institutions, and lack of flexibility for special needs such as paid and extended family leave.

It is not enough to simply declare the equality of women, condemn their mistreatment, and increase the number of women in the workplace. We must, in all sectors of society, address the structural mechanisms which deny women and girls access to the same rights and opportunities as boys and men.

□ 1300

We must also attack and eliminate the criminal and cultural practices which destroy the lives and freedom and the health of women.

Statistics prove that when women are better off in our society, their children are happier, healthier and more educated, and our world is better off.

I will do everything in my power to ensure that every piece of legislation we consider in the committee will improve the security, opportunity and prosperity of women, and I know my colleagues will share this important goal.

In honor of our wives, our mothers, our daughters, our female colleagues and our Speaker, and women around the world, I am proud to support this resolution, and I urge all my colleagues to do the same.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank Ambassador WATSON for her eloquent statements and as well as for her leadership in our Foreign Affairs Committee.

Madam Speaker, I also rise in support of H. Res. 149, supporting the goals of International Women's Day. International Women's Day has developed into a day of recognition and celebration of the contributions and social advancement of women.

I want to thank the author of this resolution, Representative SCHAKOWSKY of Illinois, for accepting the suggested changes that we had to her base text prior to the introduction and committee consideration.

These very modest clarifications emphasize that we are seeking to promote for women and girls the full and equal enjoyment of those fundamental human rights and civil liberties that are the birthright of all people, regardless of gender, race or creed, not some separate of gender-based claims or a problematic agenda related to abortion.

We must all advance the cause of human dignity by ending violence against women and girls, by protecting their fundamental freedoms and civil liberties, and promoting their genuine welfare through robust educational and economic opportunities.

To the extent that International Women's Day serves those purposes, it deserves our recognition.

I ask my colleagues to render their full support to this important measure.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of our time.

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), the author of the bill.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me and for her great support for this measure, and I also thank Representative ROS-LEHTINEN for her help for a long time making this resolution possible today.

I do rise in support of H. Res. 149, the International Women's Day resolution. I want to also thank Representative JUDY BIGGERT, who is the lead Republican sponsor, for her consistent support and work to bring this resolution to the House floor. We have introduced this resolution honoring women three times, and it has been a pleasure working with her over the years.

Also, as the vice chair of the Women's Caucus, I am honored to have this resolution to be the first of our top five priority agenda items to make it to the House floor with such remarkable bipartisan support under the leadership of the chairwomen, LOIS CAPPS and CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS. I appreciate their help.

Each year, countries around the world mark March 8 as International Women's Day as a day to recognize the contributions and the impact that women have made to our world's history, to recognize those women who have worked for gender equality and to acknowledge the work that is yet to be done.

Over the years, women have made significant strides. Women all over the world and throughout history have consistently contributed to their economies, participated in their governments and improved the quality of life of their families and their Nations.

In 2007, Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI became the first woman in the history of the United States to be Speaker of the House. In 2006, I attended the inauguration of Michelle Bachelet, the first woman President of Chile, and visited in Liberia its President Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf, the first woman President in Africa's history. In the 110th Congress, we have an all-time high of 74 women in Congress, a 35 percent increase from just 8 years ago. However, women still make up only 16 percent of the House of Representatives.

In the United States, we have made significant strides in education. In fact, women now graduate from high school at higher rates and earn bachelor's or higher degrees at greater rates than men. While that is true, yet two-thirds of the 876 million illiterate individuals in the world are women. That is, two-thirds of them are women. Two-thirds of the 125 million school-aged

children who are not attending school worldwide are girls, and girls are less likely to complete school than boys elsewhere around the world.

Women are making progress in business, and women make up 11 of the current CEOs of Fortune 500 companies. However, more progress still needs to be made. While great strides have been made in business, women still earn less, own less and have less access to education and employment than men. Globally, while women work two-thirds of the world's working hours and produce one-half of the world's food, we still earn only 1 percent of the world's income and own less than 1 percent of the world's property. Of the 300 million people living in poverty, 70 percent are girls and women.

Although Congress passed the PROTECT Act, a good bipartisan bill to prevent trafficking, there are still millions of women and girls who are trafficked, physically abused, sexually abused or face the threat of violence every day. In Iraq, Darfur and Afghanistan, women and girls continue to be the targets of extreme violence, brutality and intimidation where they face overwhelming, if not insurmountable, obstacles to legal recourse and justice. And in times of war and conflict, although most women and children are not engaged in that conflict, they continue to suffer the most.

So, Madam Speaker, it is important that Congress recognize the importance of March 8 and participate with the rest of the world in celebrating International Women's Day. Hopefully, the passage of this critical resolution will help raise awareness of the work we need to do and will help women continue to overcome the overwhelming obstacles that are still left to be overcome.

We must make a commitment to invest in women. Women contribute to the growth of economies and improve the quality of the lives of their families, the health of their communities and their Nations. We have won many battles for equality and justice for women worldwide, and we can do it.

The passage of this resolution puts us, the United States House of Representatives, firmly on the side of women who are seeking gender equality across the world, and I urge its passage.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding, and it is such a pleasure to rise in strong support of H. Res. 149 and to commend my colleague from Illinois, JAN SCHAKOWSKY, for bringing attention through this resolution to International Women's Day, and to thank my colleagues here in the House for their support of this resolution.

As my friend from Illinois has pointed out, with today's passage of this resolution, the Congressional Caucus for

Women's Issues is passing the first item on its must-pass agenda list for the 110th Congress. What a fitting way that we begin this session and acknowledge the importance of International Women's Day and the significance of it in our country and around the world.

As we look around this world and we look here at home, we see that women are reaching the highest levels of power in many parts of the world and with our own country as well. They are being elected and appointed into positions previously reserved only for men.

We see this in our communities, in business positions and education and in civic life and we see it here in Congress. As has been noted, we have for the first time in our 200-year history as a democracy we have a woman Speaker of the House. We have in this 110th Congress the most women who have every served in this House. The Senate can say the same this year.

At the same time, today, women remain around the world and here in this country more likely to live in poverty, lack education, be victimized by violence than ever before.

It is my pleasure and privilege to serve on the House Democracy Assistance Commission. In that capacity, I have visited several emerging democracies and have met with parliamentarians of other countries where these democracies are emerging. In each case, it is the women Members who reach out to me on behalf of their sisters throughout their country, and note with dismay that they have so many challenges to meet the needs of the women that they serve.

I was especially touched when I visited the women of Afghanistan in their 1-year-old democracy who have struggled over the years and are still struggling and are so determined, despite the extreme oppression by the Taliban, determined to take their role in the parliament. Both threats on their lives and harassment and violence have marred that passage. Determined to make a better life for themselves and their children.

Let me call out a similar kind of situation, a grassroots networking that I have seen and we have all experienced around this world today, networking to provide microloans from woman to woman, as is one of the nonprofit organizations called, giving women the opportunity to become self-sufficient for themselves and their families. They look to us as role models and as leaders, and yet we have our own challenges here.

So as we become that role model for so many democracies around the world in so many emerging democracies, as we see that we have challenges facing our women in this country, let us celebrate then International Women's Day this Thursday making a firmer commitment to improving the lives of women here in the United States and throughout this world.

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman

from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend from California for yielding to me and my good friend as well from Illinois for coming forward with this bill.

To tell you the truth, I had often looked at bills which celebrate groups in two ways, because I noticed that only insurgent groups have such days named for them or groups most in need, and so they become days of celebration. I have warned to them only because I have recognized why such groups have their own day, International Women's Day for example.

It is because having such a day provides an opportunity for a call to action. I wish I could come to the floor to celebrate women internationally. It is hard for me to do that when I see the progress in the global economy and look at what has happened and is happening internationally to women who are still chattel in most places in the world, who essentially would qualify as an oppressed group, not as a group seeking equality. So I think we ought to use International Women's Day to speak out for women who cannot speak for themselves.

What is to me perhaps most tragic is that the experience that most women in this country welcome is one that women across the world, particularly in developing countries, may dread, and that is the experience of pregnancy. Where pregnancy cannot be controlled by a woman, it is not the extraordinarily wonderful and welcome state that it is in our country. There will never be equality for women until women can control their own fertility.

□ 1315

As long as women are subject to men, as long as they have no control over their own fertility, then you will see women with as much HIV and AIDS as men. Where saying "no" to a man isn't something you do as a woman, but something you can't do as a woman, you are not equal.

So today I call attention to the world that our country has done very little to help women across the world control their fertility and understand what equality means. We would not have women marching for equality and toward equality today if each and every woman who chose was not able to control her fertility. May we help obtain the same for our good sisters around the world.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I am proud today to join Congresswoman JAN SCHAKOWSKY—who continues to do a great job as a Chief Deputy Whip—in recognizing the importance of International Women's Day on March 8.

Almost 100 years ago, a group of courageous women proposed creating an International Women's Day to honor the women's rights movement and to continue the fight for universal suffrage. This day has since expanded in scope to serve as an opportunity to celebrate the accomplishments of women, and

recommit ourselves to ending discrimination and violence against women across the globe.

Since the first commemoration of International Women's Day in 1910, women have made significant advances. Women have been elected to the highest levels of government across the world, and they serve as the leaders of nations such as Chile, Liberia, and Germany. An estimated 10.4 million businesses in the United States are owned by women. Worldwide, women receive eighty percent of all micro-loans to start small businesses. In the United States, women are graduating from high school and college at record rates.

However, while these accomplishments are indeed significant, we still have far more work to do. In the United States and across the world, women still face obstacles to political and economic equality. While women work two-thirds of the world's working hours, they earn only one percent of the world's income. Of the 1.3 billion people living in poverty, 70 percent are women and children. Violence against women continues at a horrific rate. These are unacceptable statistics, and we must do everything we can to change them.

As we mark this year's International Women's Day, we must renew and reaffirm our commitment to stopping violence against women and putting an end to discriminatory practices so that all women have a real opportunity to participate in society to the fullest.

By recognizing International Women's Day and all that it represents, we give hope to women across the world. We honor the women who have fought—and continue to fight—for their rights, and I am proud to stand with them as we continue efforts to achieve equality and justice.

Again, I thank Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY for introducing this important bill.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to women by supporting the goals of International Women's Day. As a woman, I recognize and honor all the women who have fought and struggled for the equality of women.

Women from all parts of the world are divided by ethnic, linguistic, cultural, economic and political differences. This day will allow for the differences to be overshadowed by the similarities. This day will enable them to look back to a tradition that represents decades of struggle for equality, justice, peace, and development.

International Women's Day recognizes the importance of securing peace and allowing social progress by identifying the rights of women to equal opportunity and freedom. Women are being given the opportunity to participate in the workforce and contribute to international peace and security; this is an extraordinary advancement.

As Members of Congress, we need to reaffirm the commitment of ending discrimination and violence against women and girls. We must continue to encourage the President to affirm his commitment to pursue policies to protect human rights and civil liberties.

Madam Speaker, the key fact remains: women themselves have the right to live in dignity. Let us rededicate ourselves to making that a reality by honoring International Women's Day. I urge my colleagues to vote in support of International Women's Day.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support the goals of International

Women's Day. This is a day that not only recognizes the struggles women and girls have faced and continue to face throughout the world, but also celebrates their significant advancements and achievements.

Founded in the United States in the early 1900's, International Women's Day has grown to be recognized throughout the world each year on March 8th: from Australia, to Singapore, to Afghanistan, to Chile. This year alone, there are 269 International Women's Day events scheduled around the globe, with 44 occurring in the United States.

Since the inception of International Women's Day, women have made considerable progress throughout the world. A vast majority of women now have the right to vote. There currently are eleven women heads of state and 27 women presiding over national assemblies across the globe—including NANCY PELOSI, the first female Speaker of the U.S. House.

Some of women's most notable legislative successes here at home include: securing the right to vote in 1920; passage of the Equal Pay Act in 1963; Title IX in 1972; and the Violence Against Women Act in 1994.

Despite these significant achievements, women in the United States and throughout the world still face obstacles to full equality. Women and girls are more likely to be illiterate, impoverished and a victim of domestic violence. Additionally, the U.S. Department of State estimates that every year, 800,000 to 900,000 people are victims of trafficking—most of them are women and girls.

I stand here today—in solidarity with women and girls around the globe—to bring attention to International Women's Day. It is important to recognize and celebrate the obstacles women have surmounted on the road to equality. Additionally, I hope to bring attention to the inequalities that we still face, so that we can continue to break down gender barriers in the hope that we can one day eradicate gender inequality.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 149, a resolution supporting International Women's Day on March 8, 2007. For several decades the international community has reserved this day to celebrate the achievements and contributions of women around the world. International Women's Day is also a time to recognize and remember the work we still have before us to achieve equal social and political rights for women.

Today, women all over the world are becoming leaders in every professional field imaginable. The achievements of women in politics are especially noteworthy. As we celebrate Women's History Month in the United States, it is my honor to recognize this important day under the historic leadership of the first woman Speaker of the House, my fellow Californian, NANCY PELOSI.

The 110th Congress also marks the rise of six women to seven committee chair positions, the most ever held by women in any prior Congress:

Congresswoman JUANITA MILLENDER-McDONALD from California is chairing the House Committee on Administration;

Congresswoman LOUISE SLAUGHTER from New York is chairing the House Rules Committee;

Congresswoman NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ from New York is chairing the House Committee on Small Business;

Congresswoman STEPHANIE TUBBS-JONES from Ohio is chairing the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct;

Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN from California is chairing the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration; and

Senator BARBARA BOXER from California is chairing the Senate Committee on the Environment and Public Works and is currently Acting Chair for the Senate Select Committee on Ethics.

These women all honor our Nation with their distinguished service and leadership.

I also want to pay special tribute to my distinguished colleague Congresswoman ROSELEHTINEN who has achieved the distinction of becoming the first woman Ranking Member on this committee. We all benefit from her contributions and those of all of the women Members who are performing important responsibilities on the Committee of Foreign Affairs with honor and distinction.

Despite notable political progress for women in leadership positions in the U.S. and around the world, women continue to struggle for equal social and political rights; access to health care, education and work; and freedom from civil conflict, violence, human trafficking and various cultural practices that put women's lives at risk.

The theme for this year's International Women's Day captures a critical goal we all must share: "ending impunity for violence against women and girls."

While manifestations of violence against women and girls vary across social, economic, cultural and historical contexts, it is clear that violence against women and girls remains a devastating reality in all parts of the world. The global evidence is chilling. Violence against women is a pervasive violation of human rights and a major impediment to achieving gender equality, development and peace.

According to the United Nations:

Domestic violence is the largest form of abuse of women worldwide, irrespective of region, culture, ethnicity, education, class and religion. Violence against women is the most common but least punished crime in the world.

The number of women forced or sold into prostitution is estimated worldwide at anywhere between 700,000 and 4 million per year. Profits from sex slavery are estimated at \$7 to \$12 billion per year. The number of women trafficked into forced labor put these numbers at even more astounding levels.

It is estimated that more than two million girls are genitally mutilated per year.

Systematic rape continues to be used as a weapon of terror in many of the world's recent conflicts—including Darfur, Bosnia and Rwanda.

While international, regional and national legal and policy frameworks have been established, to address violence against women and girls, implementation of these laws and norms remains insufficient and inconsistent around the world. Gender inequality, poverty and endless cycles of violence are exacerbated as a result of failures to hold perpetrators of violence against women and girls accountable for their actions.

Eliminating violence against women remains one of the most serious and urgent challenges of our time. Each one of us has a duty to support and sustain a political and social environment where violence against women and girls is not tolerated; where friends, family mem-

bers, neighbors, men and women, intervene to ensure these crimes and acts are not committed with impunity.

I will do everything in my power as chairman to ensure that every piece of legislation we consider in this Committee will improve the security, opportunity and prosperity of women and I know my colleagues will share this important goal.

I want to thank my colleague Congresswoman JAN SCHAKOWSKY and the other cosponsors of this resolution for giving us this opportunity to recognize the importance of International Women's Day. I am proud to support this resolution and I urge all my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today as a cosponsor of House Resolution 149, in support of International Women's Day. I thank my colleague, Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY of Illinois, for introducing this important resolution.

Women in every country around the world face an every-day battle for their safety, and for equal rights, civil rights, and human rights.

Even here in this country, every day, women are victims of sexual assault, abuse, and domestic violence.

Today, I stand with my colleagues in the House—with women in this country, and with women around the world—to make a commitment to work together to end discrimination and violence against women.

Yesterday, I returned from a trip where I led a Congressional delegation of female members to visit Iraq. While we were there, we met with Iraqi women who told us that they are treated like second class citizens.

This is unacceptable. Women in Iraq deserve the same basic human rights and civil liberties as men. It is fitting that we should take this occasion, on the day before March 8th—International Women's Day—to restate this basic and essential message.

I urge my colleagues to unanimously support this resolution, a message to women everywhere—that this House is committed to fight for their civil rights, human rights, and their right to live each day without fear of sexual abuse, assault, and domestic violence.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 149, which supports the goals of International Women's Day (IWD). International Women's Day is a day on which millions around the world come together to commemorate their continued struggle for equality, justice, peace, and development for all women around the world.

International Women's Day has grown to become a global day of recognition and celebration across developed and developing countries alike. For decades, IWD has grown from strength to strength annually. For many years the United Nations has held an annual IWD conference to coordinate international efforts for women's rights and participation in social, political and economic processes.

Madam Speaker, 1975 was designated as 'International Women's Year' by the United Nations. Women's organizations and governments around the world have also observed IWD annually on March 8 by holding large-scale events that honor women's advancement and while diligently reminding of the continued vigilance and action required to ensure that women's equality is gained and maintained in all aspects of life.

There are over 3,000,000,000 women in the world, representing 51 percent of the world's population; we need to celebrate and emphasize the important roles that women play around the world.

Throughout history women have faithfully and fervently forged a strong fight to tear down the walls of discrimination, bridge the gap between the haves and have-nots, and lay the foundation of a towering edifice of equality and justice. Some of these strong soldiers for justice include Harriet Tubman, Sojourner Truth, and Rosa Parks. I am extremely proud of the recent passage of H.R. 4510, a bill on which Senator HILLARY CLINTON and I worked diligently together to pay tribute to the enormous contributions Sojourner Truth made in the interests of all women. H.R. 4510 directs the Joint Committee on the Library to accept the donation of a bust depicting Sojourner Truth and to display the bust in a suitable location in the Capitol. On behalf of women in this country, and all around the world, it was important to urge the recognition and honor of abolitionist Sojourner Truth with the addition of her likeness to the statue commemorating women's suffrage in the United States Capitol.

Women continue to play the prominent role in caring for families within the home as well as serving as economic earners. Women are defined by their versatility. Women not only cook, clean, and care for their children, but they also own and operate businesses, teach our schoolchildren, drive buses, create art, practice medicine and law, and legislate, as well as perform in many other capacities.

All over the world women play important roles in the world of diplomacy and politics, contribute to the growth of economies, and improve the quality of the lives of their families, communities, and nations.

Madam Speaker, we recently celebrated the 2007 election of Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI as the first female Speaker of the House, a significant stride in the cause of promoting the advancement of women as leaders and major players in politics. We also witnessed the recent passage of H.R. 4510, a bill I proudly introduced which directed the Joint Committee on the Library to accept the donation of a bust depicting Sojourner Truth and to display the bust in a suitable location in the Capitol. On behalf of women in this country, and all around the world, it was important to urge the recognition and honor of abolitionist Sojourner Truth with the addition of her likeness to the statue commemorating women's suffrage in the United States Capitol. We also witnessed the 2006 election of Michelle Bachelet as the first female President of Chile; the 2006 election of Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf as the first female President in Africa's history; and the 2005 election of Angela Merkel as the first female Chancellor of Germany, who will also serve as the second woman to chair a G8 summit beginning in 2007.

Women account for 80 percent of the world's 70 million micro-borrowers and 75 percent of the 28,000 United States loans supporting small businesses in Afghanistan are made to women, and 11 women are chief executive officers of Fortune 500 companies.

In the United States, women are graduating from high school at higher rates and are earning bachelors degrees or higher degrees at greater rates than men, with 88 percent of women between the ages of 25 and 29 having

obtained a high school diploma and 31 percent of women between the ages of 25 and 29 earning a bachelors degree or higher.

But in spite of tremendous gains, women still face political and economic obstacles, struggle for basic rights, face the threat of discrimination, and are targets of violence all over the world.

Worldwide women remain vastly underrepresented in national and local assemblies, accounting on average for less than 10 percent of the seats in parliament, except for in East Asia where the figure is approximately 18 to 19 percent. In no developing region do women hold more than 8 percent of the ministerial positions.

Women work two-thirds of the world's working hours and produce half of the world's food, yet earn only 1 percent of the world's income and own less than 1 percent of the world's property.

In the United States between 1995 and 2000, female managers earned less than their male counterparts in the 10 industries that employ the vast majority of all female employees. Of the 1,300,000,000 people living in poverty around the world, 70 percent are women and children.

Madam Speaker, we need to continue to support programs that ensure women and girls across the globe are empowered with an education so that they reach their performance potentials and therefore function as productive citizens of the world.

According to the United States Agency for International Development, two-thirds of the 876,000,000 illiterate individuals worldwide are women, two-thirds of the 125,000,000 school-aged children who are not attending school worldwide are girls, and girls are less likely to complete school than boys.

Women are particularly vulnerable to health problems and we must continue to fight to ensure that every woman around the world has access to adequate health care and health insurance.

Worldwide women account for half of all cases of HIV/AIDS, approximately 42,000,000 cases, and in countries with a high prevalence of HIV/AIDS, young women are at a higher risk than young men of contracting HIV. Globally, each year over 500,000 women die during childbirth and pregnancy.

We must also provide adequate protection and support systems that empower women to avoid or discontinue the victimization of abusive relationships. Domestic violence causes more deaths and disability among women between ages 15 and 44 than cancer, malaria, traffic accidents, and war. Worldwide, at least 1 out of every 3 women and girls has been beaten in her lifetime.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, at least 1 out of every 6 women and girls in the United States has been sexually abused in her lifetime.

Worldwide, 130,000,000 girls and young women have been subjected to female genital mutilation and it is estimated that 10,000 girls are at risk of being subjected to this practice in the United States. According to the Congressional Research Service and the Department of State, illegal trafficking in women and children for forced labor, domestic servitude, or sexual exploitation involves between 1 million and 2 million women and children each year, of whom 50,000 are transported into the United States. Between 75 and 80 percent of

the world's 27,000,000 refugees are women and children.

In times and places of conflict and war, women and girls continue to be the focus of extreme violence and intimidation and face tremendous obstacles to legal recourse and justice.

Madam Speaker, March 8 has become known as International Women's Day for the last century, and is a day on which people, often divided by ethnicity, language, culture, and income, come together to celebrate a common struggle for women's equality, justice, and peace. For these reasons, the people of the United States have reason and should be eager to participate in International Women's Day.

I strongly support H. Res. 149.

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of our time.

Thank you, Ambassador Watson, and thank you to the gentlewoman from Illinois for introducing this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 149.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION BUILDING

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 584) to designate the headquarters building of the Department of Education in Washington, DC, as the Lyndon Baines Johnson Federal Building, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 584

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal building located at 400 Maryland Avenue Southwest in the District of Columbia shall be known and designated as the "Lyndon Baines Johnson Department of Education Building".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Lyndon Baines Johnson Department of Education Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 584.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the District of Columbia? There was no objection.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I commend Congressman GENE GREEN of Texas for his steadfast advocacy to this bill. In the 109th Congress, he introduced H.R. 4252, a bill to designate the Department of Education headquarters building. Lyndon Baines Johnson, "the teacher who became President," was one of the leading political figures of the 20th century, I think, on both sides of the aisle, it would be agreed.

He served the country in ways too numerous to mention, including lieutenant commander in the U.S. Navy during World War II.

A Member of both Houses of Congress, Vice President of the United States and, of course, the 36th President of the United States, we are all aware of President Johnson's humble beginnings in Stonewall, Texas. In 1927, he enrolled in Southwest Texas State Teachers College at San Marcos, Texas, now the Texas State University at San Marcos.

He graduated with a bachelor of science degree in August 1930. After graduation, he taught at Pearsall High School in Pearsall, Texas, and taught public speaking at Sam Houston High School in Houston, Texas. In a special election in 1937, President Johnson won the U.S. House of Representatives seat representing the 10th Congressional District of Texas, defeating nine other candidates. In the next election he was elected to a full term in the 76th Congress and to each succeeding Congress until 1948.

After the bombing of Pearl Harbor, on December 7, 1941, President Johnson became the first Member of Congress to volunteer for active duty in the Armed Forces, enlisting in the U.S. Navy, reporting for active duty on December 9, 1941.

President Johnson received the Silver Star for gallantry from General Douglas MacArthur.

In 1948, he campaigned for and was elected to the U.S. Senate. He was elected minority leader of the Senate in 1953 and majority leader in 1955, where he served until January 1961, when he resigned to become Vice President of the United States.

Lyndon Johnson became the 36th President of the United States on November 22, 1963, after the tragic assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

During his administration, education was one of the many areas where Johnson blazed new ground. He pursued numerous education initiatives and

signed many landmark education bills into law.

In 1963, President Johnson approved the Higher Education Facilities Act, which authorized a 5-year program of Federal grants and loans for construction for improvement of public and private higher education facilities in 1964. President Johnson signed the Library Services Act in order to make high-quality public libraries more accessible to both urban and rural residents.

Later that year, President Johnson signed the Civil Rights Act, which, among its provisions, authorized the Federal authorities to sue for the segregation of schools and to withhold Federal funds from education institutions that practiced segregation, if I may say so. The bill also authorized title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the equal employment part of the act it was my great privilege to enforce as Chair of the EEOC.

In 1965, President Johnson signed the Elementary and Secondary Act. This was the first general aid-to-education program ever adopted, and it provided programs to help educate disadvantaged children in urban and rural areas.

Later that year, he also signed the Higher Education Act, which was the first U.S. congressional approval for scholarships to undergraduate students.

In 1965 as well, President Johnson launched Project Head Start as an 8-week summer program to help break the cycle of poverty by providing preschool children of low-income families with a comprehensive program to meet their emotional, social, health, nutritional, and psychological needs.

In 1966, President Johnson signed the International Education Act, which promoted international studies at United States colleges and universities.

In 1968, he signed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act amendments of 1967, establishing bilingual education programs for non-English speaking children and providing more funds for special education for handicapped education.

Later that year, he also signed the Handicapped Children's Early Education Assistance Act, which authorized experimental programs for handicapped children of preschool age. After leaving office, President Johnson continued his involvement in education and taught students while he wrote his memoirs and pursued other academic endeavors. President Johnson died January 22, 1973.

Lyndon Baines Johnson will be remembered not only as a great President and Member of the House and of the Senate, but also as a champion of education. Thus, the Department of Education, located at 400 Maryland Avenue, Southwest, Washington, D.C., most appropriately should bear the name of and be designated as the Lyndon Baines Johnson Department of Education Building.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 584 designates the Department of Education Building as the Lyndon Baines Johnson Department of Education Building. Lyndon Baines Johnson was born in Stonewall, Texas, on August 27, 1908, and his connection to education began very early in life when at the age of 4 his mother persuaded the teacher at the nearby one-room junction school to take him as a student.

Lyndon Baines Johnson enrolled in the Southwest Texas State Teachers College in 1927. He graduated in 1930 and embarked on a teaching career that would eventually lead him to the White House. As was pointed out by the gentlelady, in 1937 he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in a special election.

He was subsequently re-elected to the House in each succeeding Congress until 1948 when he was elected to the United States Senate. In 1961, he resigned from the Senate to become the 37th Vice President; and on November 22, 1963, a day we all remember, Lyndon Baines Johnson became the 36th President of the United States.

This teacher who would become President pursued numerous education initiatives, as was pointed out. He signed into law education legislation such as the Higher Education Facilities Act, the Library Services Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the Higher Education Act, just to name a few.

After leaving office, President Johnson continued to have an impact on education, as he taught students while he was writing his memoirs, and subsequently passed away on January 22, 1973.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the gentleman from South Carolina for such time as he may consume.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, as a former public school teacher who started his educational pursuits as a 4-year-old in his mother's kindergarten, I proudly rise in support of H.R. 584, legislation to designate the headquarters building of the Department of Education here in Washington as the Lyndon Baines Johnson Federal Building.

Madam Speaker, most people remember President Johnson for his poise and confidence as he assumed the Presidency during a turbulent and mournful time for our Nation. He is also remembered for his leadership and vision with the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

It was his support in the White House for a movement that I and my brothers and sisters were fighting for on buses and at lunch counters throughout the South and helped bring here today.

But I give special thanks to his work in an area that is dear to my heart, education. President Johnson recognized the power of education to

strengthen the Nation and help bring people out of poverty. He made his name as the first education President by signing into law over 60 education bills during his Presidency, most notably the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and the Higher Education Act of 1965.

He was the first President to recognize the need for strong Federal investment in education, backing programs that funded not only elementary and secondary education, but higher education with the Federal student loan program for college and graduate school students. He gave us the Head Start Program, which since its inception has helped millions of disadvantaged children get off on the right foot by providing health, nutritional and educational assistance, recognizing that an investment in our children at an early age pays off in the long run.

His domestic vision for this country was revolutionary in the areas of civil rights and the fighting of poverty. We still see the benefits of his vision for a Great Society today. That is why I am proud to join my colleagues in passing this legislation to designate the Department of Education, the first Federal building in Washington to bear his name. I thank the gentlelady for yielding me this time, and I thank her for her leadership.

□ 1330

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I wish to yield 6 minutes to the ranking member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I want to thank Congressman GRAVES for his gracious allocation of time.

I rise in strong support for H.R. 584, a bill to name the Department of Education headquarters in Washington, D.C., as the Lyndon Baines Johnson Federal Building. I am proud to be the primary Republican sponsor of this legislation, and I believe that all the Republicans in the Texas delegation have also cosponsored this particular piece of legislation.

I commend Mr. GREEN of Texas for being the primary sponsor of the overall bill and his tireless work on this. He has worked on it for a number of years now, and it is good to see that it has finally come to fruition.

I never had the privilege to meet the late President Lyndon Baines Johnson. I wish I had. I am a great admirer of his in many ways, not so much some of the policies that he pursued, but I am a great admirer of the enthusiasm and the tenacity with which he pursued those policies.

In my first campaign for Congress in 1984, I read the first Caro book, "Path to Power," the first installment of that, and required all my campaign staff to read that book; because President Johnson, when he ran for Congress in the 1930s in the middle of the Depression, he made it a motto of his that

he would literally search out the voters of his congressional district one by one, whether they were in the fields plowing or in the stores working or at church socials or wherever. He went where the people were to spread his message.

And I took that to heart, and numerous times traveled hundreds of miles to meet with small groups and in a few cases one or two people just so I could have an option. On one occasion, I went and met with a gentleman at 6 a.m. because he didn't think I would show up at 6 a.m., and so he said meet him at 6 a.m. when he opened his business. And I was there at 5:45. On another occasion, a banker in Houston couldn't see me. I waited in his waiting room from 4 o'clock in the afternoon until 8:30 that evening, and finally, in exasperation, he agreed to see me and, before I left, had given me a substantial contribution and agreed to let me use his name on my steering committee. Those were both things that I got from the way President Johnson ran his campaign.

In terms of his policies, the two bills that he supported that became law that had the greatest impact on my life were the creation of the White House Fellows program in 1965. I was a White House Fellow in 1981 and 1982. That is a program that President Johnson established to bring young Americans to Washington for a year to work in the Cabinet agencies, and then either go back to their areas or to stay in Washington. And so far, there have been about, I believe, 700 young Americans have gone through that program. Texans like Henry Cisneros come to mind, a former White House Fellow. Colin Powell is a former White House Fellow, Senator SAM BROWNBACK in the other body is a former White House Fellow. But it had a tremendous impact on my life and led me for the first time to think about trying to become a Member of this body.

Another program that President Johnson established was the Head Start program. And in the summer I believe of 1964 or 1965, when that program was established in Waco, Texas, my mother became a Head Start assistant at Brooke Avenue Elementary School in Waco, Texas, at a time when my family was in need of financial income, and so she decided to work part time outside the home and went to work at a Head Start program; and, because of that, became a school secretary and spent her career in education. The impact on me that summer was, I was the oldest child, and it forced me to learn to cook, learn to clean and learn to take care of my three younger brothers and sisters.

I will never forget the day that my father showed up for lunch and I had been trying to make gravy. To this day, that gravy is still in the pan because it would not come out of the pan when you turned it upside down. That was my one and only attempt to learn how to make gravy. And my father

said, "From now on, son, if you need to make gravy, ask your mother to do it or ask me to do it, but nobody can eat what you are trying to make." So thanks to President Johnson, I never had to learn to cook, because that was one of the few times I even attempted it.

So I rise in strong support of this piece of legislation. President Johnson was a great President, he was a great American, and he was obviously a great Texan. And there are still people in Washington today that are effective in the political arena. People that come to mind that are still active in Washington, Jack Valenti who was for many years the president of the Motion Picture Association of America who came to Washington with President Johnson, and an attorney named Harry McPherson who is still active in his practice, he, too, was involved with the President. Some of the former members of this body, the late Jake Pickle, the late Jack Brooks, were LBJ proteges. And then former Governor of Texas, John Connelly, a good friend of mine who helped me politically when I was getting started, is another protege of Lyndon Johnson.

So I am proud to be a cosponsor of the bill with Congressman GREEN. I think it is right to honor President Johnson with this building. He wanted to be known as the "educational president" and did many, many things to bring forth public education for our citizens.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GREEN, the author of the bill, such time as he may require.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, as author and sponsor of the bill, I rise in strong support of H.R. 584. I would like to thank both Chairman OBERSTAR and Chairwoman NORTON and Ranking Member MICA and Ranking Member GRAVES for moving this legislation out of committee, and I like to thank Majority Leader HOYER for bringing it to the floor.

A bipartisan group of Texas delegation members introduced this bill to name the Department of Education headquarters building in Washington, D.C. the Lyndon Baines Johnson Federal Building. We now have over 50 cosponsors from around the country, and I am proud to be joined on this legislation by the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, JOE BARTON, who just spoke, Congressman MIKE McCAUL, and also our dean of the Texas delegation, Congressman SOLOMON ORTIZ. Representative McCAUL actually represents the Johnson family in Congress. Their bipartisan efforts have helped move this bill to the floor, and I think they should be congratulated for the efforts.

I would say one thing, though. Former Congressman Jack Brooks is not deceased. He is still much alive, and Congressman BARTON, I suspect you will be getting a call very shortly from Jack Brooks, as we all know, former dean of the Texas delegation.

I did have the opportunity at a very young age to meet President Johnson. In January 1973, I was a young State Representative in Austin, Texas, my first term. President Johnson came to our swearing in my first term in 1973, and I actually got a very candid photo with him that I hang proudly in our office here in Washington. He passed away a week later, and I was honored to be able to go to his funeral and his burial there at the Johnson Ranch.

President Johnson was a proud Texan, and back in those days, many of my Republican friends were Democrats as well. President Johnson pioneered issues such as civil rights and voting rights, but his educational leadership stands out even among these accomplishments. President Johnson passed away over 30 years ago, and to this day, he has no Federal buildings in his name in the Capitol area. So we believe the Education Building is a fitting honor. Presidents Reagan and Bush have been honored with the International Trade Center for President Reagan and the Central Intelligence Agency building for President Bush reflecting their priorities and contributions.

President Johnson presided during turbulent times in our Nation's history. He ascended to the presidency after the Kennedy assassination and faced a difficult conflict in Southeast Asia. President Johnson was a very human figure, but his legacy is with us in many ways today.

Lyndon Johnson's first priority in life was education. He was the first "Education President." Before Johnson, educational opportunity in America was not a national priority, as it continues to be today for both our parties, including current President George W. Bush.

In 1927, Lyndon Baines Johnson's career and education began when he went to Southwest Texas State Teachers College in San Marcos, Texas. He earned money as a janitor and taught the fifth, sixth, and seventh grades at the Mexican-American School in the South Texas town of Cotulla. He taught later at Sam Houston High School, which is part of our congressional district.

As a Jeff Davis High School student, which Madam Speaker, you actually visited a few years ago, in 1965 and 1966, I saw the impact of the first Federal dollars that came to my high school firsthand.

In his memoirs, President Johnson declared, "There is an old saying that kids is where the money ain't." And I need to repeat that. That may be true today, Madam Speaker, "That kids is where the money ain't, which summed up one of the major problems confronting the American educational system when I became President." And that is a direct quote.

Continuing the quote, "because of these convictions, I made a personal decision during the 1964 Presidential campaign to make education a fundamental issue and to put it high on the Nation's agenda.

"I proposed to act on my belief that, regardless of a family's financial condition, education should be available to every child in the United States, as much education as he or she could absorb. I had no intention of walking away from this fight."

President Johnson succeeded in his fight to improve education for all Americans. He signed into law 60 education bills, including the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, which established the Head Start program, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the Higher Education Act of 1965.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act was the first real Federal assistance to grade school education, and it is widely supported today. The President actually signed that in a one-room schoolhouse in Stonewall, Texas, with his elementary school teacher.

In large part, President Johnson's education priorities are accepted by both political parties, as some of them were then. The Higher Education Act passed by 368-22 in the House and 79-3 in the Senate, strong bipartisanship votes.

In discussing President Johnson's education legacy, we have to recognize First Lady, Lady Bird Johnson, who was also a major contributor and strong advocate for his educational initiatives. During her White House years, Ms. Johnson served as honorary chair of the National Head Start program, the program for underprivileged school children which prepares them to take their places in the classroom on par with their peers.

In part for her education efforts, President Ford presented her with the country's highest civilian award, the Medal of Freedom. Mrs. Johnson turned 94 last December, and hopefully she is listening to this debate.

Mrs. Johnson also received the Congressional Gold Medal from President Reagan in 1988. This legislation is a fitting honor for both President Lyndon Baines Johnson and also First Lady, Lady Bird Johnson.

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to another gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL).

Mr. McCAUL of Texas. I want to thank my colleague from Texas, Mr. GREEN, for introducing this bill. It has been a real honor to work with you on this bill. I am proud to be a lead sponsor and to have played a role in terms of whipping votes on my side of the aisle and getting this bill to the floor of the House where it stands today.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this important piece of legislation which honors a former President of the United States and his commitment to better educate the future generations of America.

Today, we will vote to name the Department of Education building in Washington, D.C., the Lyndon Baines Johnson Federal Building. And, by doing so, we honor a son of Texas who

left a positive mark on me, my family, the State of Texas, and this country.

Born on August 27, 1908, in Stonewall, Texas, Lyndon Johnson's family knew that he was destined to do great things. The future President got his experience in Washington first as a secretary to Congressman Richard Kleburg. Shortly after that, Johnson met Claudia Alta Taylor, a woman the world has come to affectionately know as Lady Bird.

In 1937, after the death of Congressman James Buchanan, Lyndon Johnson entered a special election for the 10th Congressional District of Texas, a district which I am proud to represent today. Representative Johnson beat nine other candidates to win the seat, an experience that I can personally relate to.

In addition to his tour of duty during World War II, LBJ would spend the next 23 years in the Congress as both a Congressman and Senator. During his career in the Congress, Johnson would serve as Senate minority and Senate majority leader. As President Kennedy's Vice President, Johnson served as the chairman of NASA and the Presidential Space Committee.

Lyndon Johnson early on earned a reputation for getting things done for the betterment of our Nation, and he used that intensity to lead America to land a man on the moon and continue America's dominance in space.

□ 1345

But it was Lyndon Johnson's steady and calming leadership after the assassination of President Kennedy which helped to lead our Nation through one of its most turbulent and tragic hours.

Taking the experience he had gained from his younger days as a teacher, President Johnson focused on working with the Congress and passing several landmark education bills. These initiatives served as a foundation for a new standard of education in America. Among them were programs such as Head Start, the first Federal aid to public schools and the first Federal student loan programs.

President Johnson recorded in his memoirs, he said, "I remember seeing in the folder of reading material I took to my bedroom one night, the account of a 62-year old man who learned how to write his name after years of making an X for his signature. He was so excited that he sat for a whole hour just writing his name over and over again."

Johnson said, "Reading about this man whose life had been so enriched, I was almost as excited as the man himself."

Now, that sums up so much of the man President Johnson was. In his story, our striving for increased opportunity and education took shape and became real and valid. It is this love and dedication to education that makes this bill the ideal way, in my view, and my judgment, to honor President Johnson's memory.

While President Johnson will always be remembered as a champion of the

Civil Rights Act, it was President Johnson's wish that the education papers from his Presidency be the first set of records to be made public because he believed, and I quote, in his words, "You can't get your civil rights without your education." This is why, in my judgment, he will always be known as the first "Education President."

One of the greatest honors I have had during my tenure in the Congress was the opportunity to sit down with Lady Bird Johnson, who I am proud to have as a friend and a constituent. I spoke with her about my intention to see this bill through the Congress and have the Department of Education named for her husband. And the excitement and the gratitude in her eyes that she responded with will be a memory that I will cherish for the rest of my life.

As the Representative of President Johnson's former congressional district, I have been inspired by his dedication to the American people. I specifically look back to his work in supporting the space program and education as I consider ways to further improve our great Nation.

So I urge my colleagues to honor this great Texan and to support the Lyndon Baines Johnson Department of Education Act.

May God bless Lyndon Johnson, and may God bless our national treasure, Lady Bird, may God bless Texas, and may God bless the United States of America.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, may I ask how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 5½ minutes. The gentleman has 7 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Does the gentleman have any further speakers?

Mr. GRAVES. I don't.

Madam Speaker, I would be more than happy to yield 5 minutes to Chairman NORTON.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman will control 5 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I appreciate very much the courtesy of the gentleman in yielding additional time, and I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, today, we belatedly honor the Education President by affixing his name to the Education Building.

President Johnson began as student Johnson, a Blanco County farm boy going to college in Hays County, Texas, at Southwest Texas State Teachers College. It was a time when he remarked that "poverty was so common we didn't even have a name for it."

He borrowed \$75 to get his college education, which is one of the reasons he appreciated the need for strong student financial assistance programs. And he even took leave there at Southwest Texas, as it later became known,

in order to teach school and earn a little money to stay in school.

Recently, we dedicated an LBJ museum in San Marcos to commemorate his years as a student there, recognizing that now Texas State University continues to provide quality higher education to students across the State, Nation and globe.

President Johnson continued his involvement as President with students. One of my own most memorable experiences as a university student was going with a small delegation of university student leaders to meet with President Johnson in the residence at the White House and having an opportunity to ask him questions about the important work that he was doing in Washington.

In 1994, I had the good fortune to be elected to represent the congressional district that Lyndon Johnson once served in this House, having served in the State Senate before that time.

With his own premature passing, we lost the opportunity to have his continued involvement in Texas, but we have been blessed, as other speakers have noted, with the active involvement of the woman we know only as "Lady Bird," who continues now, even at this point in her life, to make public appearances and support causes for education and other good deeds in the Central Texas area.

Similarly, we are blessed that his commitment to education is reflected in the work of his daughter, Luci Baines Johnson Turpin, and his granddaughter, Catherine Robb, who are active participants in our Central Texas community. This family recognized that, as President Johnson said of the NATO alliance many years ago, "There are no problems we cannot solve together, and very few we can solve by ourselves."

The importance of working together is true, whether our objective is to provide more children an education, guarantee seniors' retirement security or protect our veterans with the coverage that they earned and deserve.

As we name this building to honor President Johnson, I think that we share his commitment to the least, the last, and the most in need. All of us welcome this measure as a fitting tribute to a man who did so much for this country, so much for education, and so much to improve the quality of life for all Americans.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to another gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ).

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Madam Speaker, as a proud Texan, I rise this afternoon in support of H.R. 584 in naming the Department of Education Headquarters Building in Washington, D.C. after the first "Education President," President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Like myself, President Johnson began his career in the field of education and, like me, he also had to borrow money in order to attend college.

In 1927, he borrowed \$75, as indicated by the previous speaker, to attend the

Southwest Texas State Teachers College in San Marcos, Texas. He temporarily dropped out of school to serve also as a principal and teacher, and he taught at a school in South Texas in La Salle County in a city by the name of Cotulla, which is a city that I had the pleasure of representing while I was representing the 28th Congressional District. There he taught a good number of Mexican Americans as a young man.

On August 19, 1930, President Johnson graduated with a Bachelor's Degree in Science and continued teaching at Pearsall High School, also in the 28th Congressional District that I served.

Pioneering the importance of education as our President, on April 11, 1965, Johnson signed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which was the first Federal general aid to education law and focused on disadvantaged children, both in inner cities and rural communities throughout this country.

Madam Speaker, President Johnson has no Federal buildings in the District of Columbia named after him, and since he enacted over 60 education bills in his term, including the Economic Opportunity Act, Head Start, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (title I) and the Higher Education Act, (beginning student loan program), the Department of Education building is a fitting honor for President LBJ.

I urge my colleagues in joining me in passing H.R. 584.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON).

Mr. LAMPSON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding me the time, and our Republican colleagues for the graciousness in extending our time.

I first met Lyndon Baines Johnson when he was a Senator from Texas and he came to my high school and showed the commitment that he had to education and to inspiring young people to go into public service. I was one of those young people who responded to his words at that time. And I am privileged today to represent the area where the Lyndon Baines Johnson Space Center, the Johnson Space Center, is located in Texas, and it continues to be a beacon to inspire young people to enter into, particularly math and science education, critical areas that we need.

And I am also privileged to speak today in support of this piece of legislation, H.R. 584, a bill to name the Department of Education's Washington headquarters in honor of one of our Nation's greatest Presidents, President Lyndon Baines Johnson.

As a Texan, it gives me particular pride to help this effort to name the building after a man who did so much to enhance and improve the educational system for all Americans. Not only did he begin his storied career in public service as an educator, as I did, and some of my colleagues who have

already spoken, President Johnson also ushered in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and the Higher Education Act of 1965, all keystones in our efforts to provide excellent and enduring educational opportunities for all of our children.

The House should take this simple step to honor a great leader and educator and, of course, a great Texan. It is a fitting tribute to his family that remains, including Lady Bird. I ask for the support of all Members of this piece of legislation, H.R. 584.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, may I ask Mr. GRAVES, the gentleman from Missouri, whether he has any more speakers and if he is prepared to yield back his time?

Mr. GRAVES. I have none. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman again for his courtesy in allowing a number of Members to speak with the time he provided.

Madam Speaker, before I yield back the remainder of our time, I must say that it would be hard to find a greater domestic policy President than Lyndon Baines Johnson. The only one I could think of would be FDR himself, and of course, President Johnson updated the Roosevelt New Deal. In fact, we are naming the education building, the Department of Education building after President Johnson. We could as soon have named the HHS building. This is the Medicare President. This is the Medicaid President.

On both sides of the aisle, the historic accomplishments of this great President have been embraced. And I must tell you, they have certainly been embraced by our constituents. He updated the New Deal. And as we consider what domestic legislation lies ahead for us, I think we would do well to remember that history gets made in one era; and the New Deal era with Social Security, unemployment insurance and the like, and then in another era, new issues come forward. President Johnson found those issues. None could have been more important than education and health care, and I appreciate the bipartisan nature of this bill.

No building should be named in Washington that is not embraced on both sides of the aisle, and there is no more appropriate person to name this building after than President Lyndon Baines Johnson.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 584, a bill to designate the Department of Education headquarters building located at 400 Maryland Avenue Southwest in the District of Columbia as the "Lyndon Baines Johnson Department of Education Building."

I commend the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GREEN, and his colleagues of the Texas delegation, for their steadfast advocacy for this bill. In the 109th Congress, Mr. GREEN introduced a similar bill, H.R. 4252. Regrettably, the House did not take action on that legislation.

Lyndon Baines Johnson, "the Teacher who became President," was one of the leading

political figures of the 20th century. He served his country in ways too numerous to detail, including as lieutenant commander in the U.S. Navy during World War II, Member of both houses of Congress, Vice President of the United States, and the 36th President of the United States.

President Johnson was born on August 27, 1908, in Stonewall, TX. In 1927, he enrolled in Southwest Texas State Teachers College at San Marcos, TX—Texas State University—San Marcos. He took a leave of absence for a year to serve as principal and teach fifth, sixth, and seventh grades at Welhausen School, a school in the south Texas town of Cotulla. He graduated with a bachelor of science degree in August 1930. After graduation, he taught at Pearsall High School in Pearsall, TX, and taught public speaking at Sam Houston High School in Houston, TX.

In a special election in 1937, Johnson won the U.S. House of Representatives seat representing the 10th Congressional District of Texas, defeating nine other candidates. In the next election, he was re-elected to a full term in the 76th Congress and to each succeeding Congress until 1948.

After the bombing of Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, Johnson became the first Member of Congress to volunteer for active duty in the Armed Forces—U.S. Navy, reporting for active duty on December 9, 1941. Johnson received the Silver Star from GEN Douglas MacArthur for gallantry in action during an aerial combat mission over hostile positions in New Guinea on June 9, 1942. President Roosevelt ordered all Members of Congress in the Armed Forces to return to their offices, and Johnson was released from active duty on July 16, 1942.

In 1948, he campaigned for and was elected to the U.S. Senate. He was elected minority leader of the Senate in 1953 and majority leader in 1955, where he served until January 1961, when he resigned to become Vice President.

Lyndon Johnson became the 36th President of the United States on November 22, 1963, after the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

During President Johnson's administration, education was one of the many areas where Johnson blazed new ground. He pursued numerous education initiatives, and signed many landmark education bills into law.

In 1963, President Johnson approved the Higher Education Facilities Act—P.L. 88-204—which authorized a 5-year program of Federal grants and loans for construction or improvement of public and private higher education academic facilities. This legislation created the largest education program since enactment of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and it was the first comprehensive education bill enacted in the post-World War II period that was not tied to national defense.

In 1964, President Johnson signed the Library Services Act—P.L. 88-269—to make high quality public libraries more accessible to both urban and rural residents. The funds made available under this act were used to construct as well as operate libraries, and to extend this program to cities as well as rural areas. Later that year, President Johnson signed the Civil Rights Act—P.L. 88-352—which, among its landmark provisions, authorized Federal authorities to sue for the deseg-

regation of schools and to withhold Federal funds from education institutions that practiced segregation.

In 1965, President Johnson signed the Elementary and Secondary Act—P.L. 89-10. This legislation was the first general aid-to-education program ever adopted by Congress, and it provided programs to help educate disadvantaged children in urban and rural areas. Later that year, he also signed the Higher Education Act—P.L. 89-329, which was the first program approved by Congress for scholarships to undergraduate students.

President Johnson launched Project Head Start, as an 8-week summer program in 1965, to help break the cycle of poverty by providing pre-school children of low-income families with a comprehensive program to meet their emotional, social, health, nutritional, and psychological needs. Recruiting children ages three to school-entry age, Head Start was enthusiastically received by education and child development specialists, community leaders, and parents across the Nation. Currently, Head Start continues to serve children and their families each year in urban and rural areas in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. territories, including many American Indian and migrant children.

In 1966, President Johnson signed the International Education Act—P.L. 89-698, which promoted international studies at U.S. colleges and universities.

In 1968, he signed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967—P.L. 90-247, establishing bilingual education programs for non-English speaking children, and providing more funds for special education for disabled children. Later that year, President Johnson also signed the Handicapped Children's Early Education Assistance Act—P.L. 90-538, which authorized experimental programs for disabled children of preschool age.

After leaving office, Lyndon Baines Johnson continued his involvement in education and taught students while he wrote his memoirs and pursued other academic endeavors. Lyndon Johnson died January 22, 1973.

Lyndon Baines Johnson will be remembered not only as a great President and Member of Congress, but also as a champion for education. Thus, it is very appropriate that the headquarters building of the Department of Education, located at 400 Maryland Avenue Southwest in the District of Columbia, be designated as the "Lyndon Baines Johnson Department of Education Building."

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 584.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, today I join Congressman GENE GREEN and a bipartisan group of the Texas delegation in supporting the renaming of the Department of Education headquarters building to the "Lyndon Baines Johnson Federal Building."

It is a fitting tribute to name the building that houses the Department of Education after President Lyndon B. Johnson. Under his watch, over 60 education bills were signed into law, several of which changed the face of education in America.

One such bill enacted by President Johnson is the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. For the first time, Federal funds were explicitly directed to elementary and secondary public schools. These funds have improved the quality of education received by millions of students over the past 42 years.

President Johnson soon followed this measure with the Higher Education Act of 1965. This legislation made a college education possible for millions of Americans by creating the Federal student aid program.

Additionally, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 contained the provisions creating the Head Start Program, which has put generations of preschool-age children on the path of learning and success. Head Start gives children the foundation they need in order to be successful in school in the future.

As President Johnson himself once said, "Poverty must not be a bar to learning and learning must offer an escape from poverty." By opening the doors of education to millions of Americans, President Johnson improved countless lives and put the American dream within the reach of many.

I thank Congressman GREEN for bringing this bill to the floor so that we all may recognize the contributions of President Johnson to this Nation and to our educational system.

Mr. ORTIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 584, a bill introduced by my friend GENE GREEN of Houston, which names the Department of Education Headquarters Building in Washington, DC, after President Lyndon B. Johnson.

President Johnson's legacy is vast and mostly underappreciated. He was a visionary in terms of groundbreaking social legislation that literally changed the way this country elected leaders, treated one another in the workplace, and educated our children.

President Johnson passed away over 30 years ago, and is survived by his First Lady, Lady Bird Johnson. Despite the groundbreaking work in education and so many other levels, no Federal buildings bear his name in the national Capital area.

In May 1964, Johnson called for a nationwide war against poverty and outlined a vast program of economic and social welfare legislation designed to create what he termed the Great Society. Central to his vision of a nation no longer hindered by poverty and hate was an education for every child, no matter what their economic status.

During his time in office, President Johnson passed over 60 education bills, including the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the Higher Education Act of 1965, and created the Head Start Program. Taken together, these legislative feats form the basis of public education in the United States today.

President Johnson grew up in San Marcos, TX, seeing abject poverty all around him and seeing the power scheme that separated white children from Hispanic and African-American children. From his earliest days, he concluded the only true equalizing influence in our Nation was through an equal education for all Americans, no matter what their skin color or their economic status.

The Department of Education headquarters building on Maryland Avenue, SW., in Washington, DC, has no name on it today. Bearing the name of our 36th President would be a fitting tribute to the life and legislative accomplishments in education of the Johnson presidency.

While novel in his day, the Johnson administration's policy to place a national priority on education is supported by large majorities of both parties today, illustrating the long-term righteousness of Johnson's cause.

Truly, the only silver bullet to equalize people in this Nation is education. That was LBJ's

vision, and perfecting that vision should be our duty in the 21st century.

I thank the gentleman from Texas for his work in bringing this bill to the floor today.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 584, a bill to name the headquarters of the United States Department of Education after President Lyndon B. Johnson.

In the entire District of Columbia, with all its Federal buildings, parks and monuments, there is not a single Federal facility named after the man many historians call one of the best Presidents in American history. From his stewardship of legislation creating Medicare and Medicaid, to his passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, President Johnson left a legacy on this Nation that we still enjoy today.

In addition to his quest to achieve racial equality in the United States, President Johnson was an avid supporter of education. In 1965 he signed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act into law. This landmark bill provided significant federal funding to public schools. Also in 1965, he stewarded the Higher Education Act to passage. Thanks to this legislation, children in poverty for the first time were able to attend college.

Madam Speaker, like President Johnson, I was a public school teacher, and I understand the importance of a good education. Let me conclude by quoting President Johnson himself.

I shall never forget the faces of the boys and the girls in that little Welhausen Mexican School, and I remember even yet the pain of realizing and knowing then that college was closed to practically every one of those children because they were too poor. And I think it was then that I made up my mind that this Nation could never rest while the door to knowledge remained closed to any American.

Madam Speaker, I can think of no better person after whom we should name the building of the Department of Education. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 584.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Madam Speaker, I rise in proud support of H.R. 584, a bill to re-name the Department of Education Building after a great Texan and a great American, Lyndon Baines Johnson. I would like to thank my good friend and colleague, GENE GREEN for bringing this bill to us.

Today, we aspire to fulfill the vision of the Great Society that President Johnson envisioned for this Nation—in his words—a place where the meaning of man's life matches the marvels of man's labor.

Early on in his life, President Johnson was exposed to the unacceptable inequities in our Nation's education system. As a teacher and a principal in Cotula, TX, President Johnson worked with impoverished Hispanic students for whom the dream of pursuing higher education was all but out of reach. He saw a nation failing to live up to its potential because it failed to develop the talents of its low-income and minority citizens. He vowed not to rest until America's opportunities were open and accessible to everyone.

It is a fitting tribute to name the Department of Education headquarters after the President who brought us the Head Start Program, the Higher Education Act and student financial aid, as well as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which today we know as the No Child Left Behind Act.

Under his watch, our Nation made a commitment to education so that opportunity and success would no longer be determined by family wealth or the color of one's skin.

President Johnson was a visionary and a patriot. For me, a member of the Education and Labor Committee, he was a hero.

I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 584.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 584, legislation to designate the Department of Education headquarters in Washington, DC, after our 36th President, Lyndon Baines Johnson.

An elementary school teacher himself, President Johnson had a deep appreciation for the importance of education. In his "Great Society" speech at the University of Michigan in 1964, President Johnson stated:

We must seek an educational system which grows in excellence as it grows in size. This means better training for our teachers. It means preparing youth to enjoy their hours of leisure as well as their hours of labor. It means exploring new techniques of teaching, to find new ways to stimulate the love of learning and the capacity for creation.

President Johnson's statement rings true to this day. Now is an especially important time to revisit his vision. As the global marketplace becomes more competitive, it is becoming clear that education is the vehicle that will drive U.S. global leadership into the future. It is therefore vital that we renew our commitment to Federal education programs.

Some of President Johnson's largest education initiatives were passed in 1965, including the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—ESEA—and the Higher Education Act HEA. ESEA provided the first program ever adopted by Congress to provide Federal support for public schools, and HEA provided the first-ever Federal financial aid programs to help students afford college. In addition, 1965 saw the passage of legislation to create the National Head Start program and the National Endowments for Arts and Humanities.

For over 40 years, President Johnson's education initiatives have helped millions of children across the country achieve the American dream. It is only fitting that the Federal Department of Education building be named after a man who was a pioneer in his endeavors to promote Federal investment in education.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for it.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation to name the Department of Education Building in honor of President Lyndon B. Johnson.

President Johnson believed that everyone should have the right to a free and adequate education regardless of their gender, race or economic status. President Johnson fought for opportunity and access for all Americans, and I can truly think of no one better person for whom to name the Department of Education building.

President Johnson's first job was as a Texas elementary school teacher and principal at a segregated school attended by only Mexican-Americans. He held that experience with him, and continually fought for education and equality for all Americans. President Johnson recognized that education meant opportunity for millions of Americans who would otherwise never be able to achieve the American dream.

The strides made for educational equality and fairness under the Johnson administration were truly remarkable. Under President Johnson, we adopted many landmark education policies including the Early and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for Humanities, and the Higher Education Act of 1965. Perhaps no other President has ever overseen so many pioneering changes to the way that we educate our Nation's children.

I fully support Congressman GENE GREEN's effort to name the U.S. Department of Education building in honor of President Lyndon B. Johnson, and I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this legislation.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, as an original cosponsor and proud Texan, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 584, which designates the national headquarters building of the U.S. Department of Education located in the District of Columbia as the Lyndon Baines Johnson Department of Education Building. I support this bill because it is a fitting tribute to the greatest "education President" in the history of our Nation.

It is no exaggeration to say, Madam Speaker, that Lyndon Baines Johnson's record of extending the benefits of education to all Americans in every region of the country, of every race and gender, irrespective of economic class or family background, remains unsurpassed. Lyndon Johnson recognized that the educated citizenry is a nation's greatest economic asset and most powerful guardian of its political liberties.

Madam Speaker, Lyndon Johnson did more than any single American, living or dead, to make the Federal Government a partner with States and localities in the vitally important work of educating the people of America, from pre-kindergarten to post-graduate school. It makes perfect sense, therefore, to name the headquarters building of the U.S. Department of Education in his honor.

Madam Speaker, Lyndon Baines Johnson was one of the leading figures of the 20th century. This teacher who became a President served his country in numerous, distinguished ways, including as lieutenant commander in the U.S. Navy during World War II, as a Member of both Houses of Congress, as Vice President of the United States, and as the 36th President of the United States.

Lyndon Baines Johnson was born on August 27, 1908, in Stonewall, TX. In 1927, he enrolled in Southwest Texas State Teachers College at San Marcos, TX—Texas State University—San Marcos. He took a leave of absence for a year to serve as principal and teach fifth, sixth, and seventh grades at Welhausen School, a Mexican-American school in the south Texas town of Cotulla. He graduated with a bachelor of science degree in August 1930. After graduation he taught at Pearsall High School in Pearsall, TX, and taught public speaking at Sam Houston High School in Houston, TX. In the spring of 1931, his debate team won the district championship.

In a special election in 1937, Johnson won the U.S. House of Representatives seat representing the 10th Congressional District of Texas, defeating nine other candidates. He was re-elected to a full term in the 76th Congress and to each succeeding Congress until 1948.

After the bombing of Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, Johnson became the first

Member of Congress to volunteer for active duty in the Armed Forces—U.S. Navy, reporting for active duty on December 9, 1941. Johnson received the Silver Star from GEN Douglas MacArthur for gallantry in action during an aerial combat mission over hostile positions in New Guinea on June 9, 1942. President Roosevelt ordered all Members of Congress in the Armed Forces to return to their offices, and Johnson was released from active duty on July 16, 1942.

In 1948, after a campaign in which he traveled by "newfangled" helicopter all over the State, Johnson won the primary by 87 votes and earned the nickname "Landslide Lyndon," and in the general election was elected to the U.S. Senate. He was elected minority leader of the Senate in 1953 and majority leader in 1955. He served in the U.S. Senate until he resigned to become Vice President in January 1961.

Lyndon Johnson became the 36th President of the United States on November 22, 1963, after the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

During his administration, education was one of the many areas where President Johnson blazed new ground. He pursued numerous education initiatives, and signed many landmark education bills into law.

In 1963, President Johnson approved the Higher Education Facilities Act—P.L. 88-204, which authorized a five-year program of Federal grants and loans for construction or improvement of public and private higher education academic facilities. This legislation was the largest education program enacted by Congress since the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and it was the first broad education bill enacted in the post-World War II period that was not tied to national defense.

In 1964, Johnson signed the Library Services Act—P.L. 88-269—to make high quality public libraries more accessible to both urban and rural residents. The funds made available under this act were used to construct as well as operate libraries, and to extend this program to cities as well as rural areas. Later that year, President Johnson signed the Civil Rights Act—P.L. 88-352, which among its landmark provisions authorized Federal authorities to sue for the desegregation of schools and to withhold Federal funds from education institutions that practiced segregation.

In 1965, President Johnson signed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—P.L. 89-10—at the former Junction Elementary School in Stonewall, TX, where he first attended school. Sitting beside him as he signed the bill was his first teacher, Mrs. Kathryn Deadrich Loney. This legislation was the first general aid-to-education program ever adopted by Congress, and it provided programs to help educate disadvantaged children in urban and rural areas. Later that year, he also signed the Higher Education Act—P.L. 89-329, which was the first program approved by the U.S. Congress for scholarships to undergraduate students.

In 1965, President Johnson launched Project Head Start, as an 8-week summer program, to help break the cycle of poverty by providing pre-school children from low-income families with a comprehensive program to meet their emotional, social, health, nutritional, and psychological needs. Recruiting children from ages three to school-entry age, Head

Start was enthusiastically received by education and child development specialists, community leaders, and parents across the Nation. Currently, Head Start continues to serve children and their families each year in urban and rural areas in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. territories, as well as many migrant children.

In 1966, President Johnson signed the International Education Act—P.L. 89-698, which promoted international studies at U.S. colleges and universities.

In 1968, he signed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967—P.L. 90-247, establishing bilingual education programs for non-English speaking children, and providing more funds for special education for disabled children. Later that year, he also signed the Handicapped Children's Early Education Assistance Act—P.L. 90-538, which authorized experimental programs for disabled children of pre-school age.

After leaving office, Lyndon Johnson returned to his native Texas and continued his involvement in public education. His presidential papers are housed at the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library and Museum at the University of Texas, which in 1970 established the Lyndon Baines Johnson School of Public Affairs, The "LBJ School," as is commonly known, pioneered what was then regarded as a novel approach to training for public service.

The curriculum combined courses in theory with courses that took students into government agencies to work and conduct research; the faculty included academics from various disciplines as well as practitioners from various levels of government; public service programs included an academic publishing program as well as workshops for government officials. This blend of the academic and the practical remains the distinguishing characteristic of the LBJ School and this highly effective approach to training for public service is today an accepted model for public affairs graduate programs across the country.

Madam Speaker, Lyndon Baines Johnson, who died January 22, 1973, will be remembered not only as a great President and Member of Congress, but also as the greatest champion of accessible and affordable quality education for all. President Johnson truly understood the importance of leaving no child behind, and he didn't.

For all these reasons, Madam Speaker, it is most appropriate that the headquarters building of the Department of Education located at 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., in the District of Columbia be designated the "Lyndon Baines Johnson Department of Education Building."

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 584, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "To designate the Federal building located at 400 Maryland Avenue Southwest in the District of Columbia as the 'Lyndon Baines Johnson Department of Education Building'".

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1400

R. JESS BROWN UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 399) to designate the United States Courthouse to be constructed in Jackson, Mississippi, as the "R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 399

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States Courthouse to be constructed at the site bounded on the north by Court Street, on the west by West Street, on the south by South Street, and on the east by President Street in Jackson, Mississippi, shall be known and designated as the "R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROTHMAN). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material concerning H.R. 399.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia?

There was no objection.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to support H.R. 399, a bill to designate the courthouse to be constructed in Jackson, Mississippi, as the R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse.

R. Jess Brown was born in Coffeyville, Kansas on September 2, 1912. He was educated in the Muskogee, Oklahoma, public schools and received a bachelor of education degree from the Illinois State Normal University in 1935 and a master of education degree from the University of Indiana in 1943. He attended Texas Southern Law School.

In 1953, he was admitted to the bar for the State of Mississippi and admitted to practice before the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi. In 1955, he co-founded the Magnolia Bar Association, and he later served on the board of the National Bar Association for nearly 15 years. In 1958, he was admitted to prac-

tice before the United States Supreme Court.

As associate counsel for the NAACP Defense and Educational Fund, Mr. Brown filed the first civil rights suit in Mississippi in the 1950s in Jefferson Davis County, seeking the enforcement of the right of black citizens to become registered voters. In 1961, Mr. Brown represented James H. Meredith in a suit to enter the University of Mississippi. This victory in this case opened the doors to that university to all Mississippi citizens. While an associate with the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, he played a major role in fighting discrimination in transportation and other public accommodations, working together with Thurgood Marshall, who would later become Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. Brown also served as counsel to the American Civil Liberties Union, where he was successful in obtaining reversals of convictions of black defendants because of discrimination in jury selection. He also represented numerous black defendants in cases where the State sought the death penalty. As a result of these appeals, none of these defendants were ever executed.

R. Jess Brown died in Jackson, Mississippi, on January 2, 1990. He is remembered as a brave American, brilliant attorney, civil rights leader, and devoted family man. It is both fitting and appropriate that the United States courthouse, soon to be constructed in Jackson, Mississippi, would be designated the R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 399 designates the United States courthouse, which is to be constructed in Jackson, Mississippi, as the R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse. This bill honors R. Jess Brown's work as an attorney and civil rights leader.

As was so eloquently pointed out, and I think Chairman NORTON went through it very well, Mr. Brown was the associate counsel for the Legal Defense and Education Fund for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, where his work was well documented.

He worked alongside Thurgood Marshall, who would later become Associate Justice to the United States Supreme Court. And as Mr. Brown was working for the NAACP in that capacity, he filed the very first civil rights suit in Mississippi in the 1950s.

Mr. Brown died in Jackson, Mississippi, on January 2, 1990.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce the author of the bill, who represents the district in Jackson, Mississippi, where this courthouse will be located.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 399,

the bill naming the soon-to-be-constructed courthouse in Jackson, Mississippi, after attorney R. Jess Brown.

For most of those individuals here, I represent Jackson, Mississippi. I knew R. Jess Brown. Most of the African American attorneys in the State of Mississippi would not be there had it not been for R. Jess Brown's tenacity and perseverance to encourage other people to participate.

Both speakers have talked about his ability as a lawyer; but the one thing that I would like to share is, while he did not graduate from law school, when he was practicing, you could practice law if you could pass the bar. He taught himself law and ultimately became one of the great lawyers in our State. He represented James Meredith. He represented Medgar Evers. He represented teachers who were trying to get equity in pay. He represented other students trying to go to the University of Southern Mississippi, a number of schools.

But the good thing about R. Jess Brown, Mr. Speaker, he also was a teacher. He always had time for young people. He taught at Alcorn State University as well as Lanier High School at a time where practicing law was not as beneficial as it is perhaps now.

I am happy to join the support of H.R. 399, this bill nominating the soon-to-be-constructed courthouse after R. Jess Brown.

The Brown family in Jackson, Mississippi, is well known. The widow of attorney Brown will be quite pleased with this. Oftentimes we don't give flowers to people while they are living, but perhaps this legacy in naming this Federal courthouse after attorney R. Jess Brown is fitting and proper.

So R. Jess Brown, Mr. Speaker, will be remembered more than as a brilliant attorney and civil rights leader. He will be remembered as a great American. As such, it is very appropriate that the United States courthouse soon to be built in Jackson, Mississippi, is designated the R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 399, a bill to designate the United States Courthouse to be constructed in Jackson, Mississippi, as the "R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse".

R. Jess Brown was born in Coffeyville, Kansas, on September 2, 1912. He was educated in the Muskogee Oklahoma public schools and received a Bachelor of Education Degree from Illinois State Normal University in 1935, and a Master of Education Degree from the University of Indiana in 1943. He attended Texas Southern Law School.

In 1948, he was a co-plaintiff in a suit for equal salaries for Jackson, Mississippi school teachers.

In 1953, he was admitted to the bar for the State of Mississippi and admitted to practice before the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi. In 1955, he co-founded the Magnolia Bar Association, and he later served on the Board of the National Bar Association for nearly 15 years. In 1958, he was admitted to practice before the United States Supreme Court.

As associate counsel for the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Brown filed the first civil rights suit in Mississippi in the 1950s in Jefferson Davis County, seeking the enforcement of the right of black citizens to become registered voters. In 1961, Brown represented James H. Meredith in his suit to enter the University of Mississippi; his victory in this case opened the doors of that university to all of Mississippi's citizens. While an associate with the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, he played a major role in fighting discrimination in the areas of transportation and other public accommodations working along side Thurgood Marshall, who would later become Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

Brown also served as counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union, where he was successful in obtaining reversals of convictions of black defendants because of discrimination in jury selection. He also represented numerous black defendants in cases where the State sought the death penalty. As a result of these appeals, none of these defendants were ever executed.

R. Jess Brown died in Jackson, Mississippi, on January 2, 1990.

R. Jess Brown will be remembered as more than a brilliant attorney and civil rights leader; he will also be remembered as a great American. As such, it is very appropriate that the U.S. Courthouse in Jackson, Mississippi, be designated the "R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse".

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 399.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I think this bill deserves the unanimous vote of Members on both sides of the aisle. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 399.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SANTIAGO E. CAMPOS UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 544) to designate the United States courthouse at South Federal Place in Santa Fe, New Mexico, as the "Santiago E. Campos United States Courthouse".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 544

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States courthouse at South Federal Place in Santa Fe, New Mexico, shall be known and designated as the "Santiago E. Campos United States Courthouse".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Santiago E. Campos United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material concerning H.R. 544.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia?

There was no objection.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in the 107th, 108th and 109th Congresses, Congressman Tom Udall introduced legislation to designate the Federal courthouse in Santa Fe, New Mexico, as the Santiago E. Campos United States Courthouse. No action was taken during the past Congress. Therefore, it is with great pleasure that the 110th Congress finally moves forward with this bill to honor an outstanding American.

Judge Campos was a life-long resident of the United States and graduated first in his class from the University of New Mexico and his country with honor and great distinction. He was a World War II veteran, serving the United States Navy as a seamen first class from 1944 to 1946. After leaving the Navy, Judge Campos attended the Central College in Fayette, Missouri, and received his law degree from the University of New Mexico in 1953, graduating first in his class again. From 1954 to 1957, he worked as an assistant attorney general and subsequently as first assistant attorney general for the State of New Mexico. After 14 years in private practice, Judge Campos was elected district judge for the First Judicial District of New Mexico in 1971 and served in that capacity until 1978.

President Jimmy Carter appointed him to the Federal bench in 1978. Judge Campos was the first Hispanic appointed to the Federal bench in New Mexico. He served as chief judge from 1987 until 1989. Known for his compassion, quick wit and inquisitive mind, Judge Campos was a role model for students, fellow jurists and professional colleagues. He was well liked among peers and judicial staff as well.

I strongly support Congressman UDALL and his efforts on behalf of this bill, and I urge my colleagues to join in support of H.R. 544.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I would yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 544, introduced by Representative UDALL of New Mexico, designates the United States courthouse at South Federal Place in Santa Fe, New Mexico, as the Santiago E. Campos United States Courthouse. The bill honors Judge Campos, who was the first Hispanic to be appointed to the U.S. District Court of New Mexico.

Judge Campos served in the United States Navy during World War II and graduated first in his law class at the University of New Mexico. His career in public service included serving as the assistant and first assistant attorney general in New Mexico, and serving as a district court judge in New Mexico's First Judicial District, and culminated in his appointment to the Federal bench.

Judge Campos was appointed by President Carter in 1978 to the District Court of New Mexico. He served as chief judge from 1987 to 1989 and became a senior judge on December 26, 1992. He served with distinction on the bench, and on January 20, 2001, Judge Campos passed away.

I support this legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman. And I concur and strongly support this legislation as well.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 544, a bill to designate the United States Courthouse at South Federal Place, Santa Fe, New Mexico, as the "Santiago E. Campos United States Courthouse".

I commend the Gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) for his steadfast support of this bill to honor an outstanding jurist.

Mr. UDALL introduced identical legislation in three previous Congresses—H.R. 5083 in the 107th Congress, H.R. 2274 in the 108th Congress, and H.R. 984 in the 109th Congress. Regrettably, the House never considered those bills. I am pleased that we are moving forward on this legislation today.

Santiago E. Campos was born on December 25, 1926, in Santa Rosa, New Mexico. He served in the United States Navy as a Seaman 1st Class from 1944 to 1946. After leaving the Navy, Judge Campos attended Central College in Fayette, Missouri, and received his law degree from the University of New Mexico in 1953, graduating first in his class.

From 1954 until 1957, he worked as an Assistant Attorney General and subsequently as First Assistant Attorney General for the State of New Mexico. After 14 years in private practice, Judge Campos was elected District Judge for the 1st Judicial District of New Mexico in 1971, and served in that capacity until 1978. In 1978, Judge Campos was appointed to the Federal Bench by President Jimmy Carter and began serving on July 20, 1978.

Judge Campos was the first Hispanic American to serve as a Federal Judge in the District Court of New Mexico, as well as the first Hispanic American to serve as its Chief Judge. He held the title of Chief U.S. District Judge from February 5, 1987, to December 31, 1989, and took senior status on December 26, 1992. Judge Campos died on January 20, 2002, after suffering a long bout with cancer.

During his career, Judge Campos was named an honorary member of the Order of the Coif. He also received the Distinguished Achievement Award of the State Bar of New Mexico in 1993, and in the same year the University of New Mexico honored him with a Distinguished Achievement Award.

H.R. 544 has received the unanimous endorsement of the Judges of the 10th Circuit Court in New Mexico and the district judges of the District of New Mexico.

In honor of Judge Campos's trailblazing legal career in New Mexico and his outstanding contributions to the legal profession, it is both fitting and proper to designate the courthouse located at South Federal Place in Santa Fe, New Mexico, as the "Santiago E. Campos United States Courthouse".

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 544.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 544.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1415

CHARLIE W. NORWOOD LIVING ORGAN DONATION ACT

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 710) to amend the National Organ Transplant Act to clarify that kidney paired donation does not involve the transfer of a human organ for valuable consideration, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 710

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Charlie W. Norwood Living Organ Donation Act".

SEC. 2. NATIONAL ORGAN TRANSPLANT ACT; AMENDMENT REGARDING PAIRED DONATION OF HUMAN KIDNEYS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 301(a) of the National Organ Transplant Act (42 U.S.C. 274e(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following: "The preceding sentence does not apply with respect to the paired donation of human kidneys."

(b) DEFINITION.—Section 301(c) of the National Organ Transplant Act (42 U.S.C. 274e(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(4) The term 'paired donation of human kidneys' means the donation and receipt of human kidneys under the following circumstances:

"(A) An individual (referred to in this paragraph as the 'first donor') desires to make a living donation of a kidney specifically to a particular patient (referred to in this paragraph as the 'first patient'), but such donor is biologically incompatible as a donor for such patient.

"(B) A second individual (referred to in this paragraph as the 'second donor') desires

to make a living donation of a kidney specifically to a second particular patient (referred to in this paragraph as the 'second patient'), but such donor is biologically incompatible as a donor for such patient.

"(C) Subject to subparagraph (D), the first donor is biologically compatible as a donor of a kidney for the second patient, and the second donor is biologically compatible as a donor of a kidney for the first patient.

"(D) If there is any additional donor-patient pair as described in subparagraph (A) or (B), each donor in the group of donor-patient pairs is biologically compatible as a donor of a kidney for a patient in such group.

"(E) All donors and patients in the group of donor-patient pairs (whether two pairs or more than two pairs) enter into a single agreement to donate and receive such kidneys, respectively, according to such biological compatibility in the group.

"(F) Other than as described in subparagraph (E), no valuable consideration is knowingly acquired, received, or otherwise transferred with respect to the kidneys referred to in such subparagraph."

SEC. 3. ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR THE MEDICAL CARE PHYSICIAN ASSISTANCE AND QUALITY INITIATIVE FUND.

Section 1848(l)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4(l)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by adding at the end the following: "In addition, there shall be available to the Fund for expenditures during 2009 an amount equal to \$30,000,000 and for expenditures during or after 2013 an amount equal to \$470,000,000"; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in the heading, by striking "FURNISHED DURING 2008";

(B) by striking "specified in subparagraph (A)" and inserting "specified in the first sentence of subparagraph (A)"; and

(C) by inserting after "furnished during 2008" the following: "and for the obligation of the entire first amount specified in the second sentence of such subparagraph for payment with respect to physicians' services furnished during 2009 and of the entire second amount so specified for payment with respect to physicians' services furnished on or after January 1, 2013".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 710

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered as the first sponsor of H.R. 710, a bill originally introduced by Representative Norwood of Georgia, only for the purpose of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to pass the Charlie W. Norwood Living Kidney Organ Donation Clarification Act. We do so both to honor Dr. Norwood, who provided such great service to his district and to the country for many years; of course, Dr. Norwood did so as the result of being a recipient of lung transplants himself; but also to honor the thousands of Americans who are today waiting for kidney transplants. This bill, we believe, will be a great step forward to hasten the day when those folks can potentially have kidney transplants.

It is a fitting tribute to Dr. Norwood for his tireless efforts to improve our Nation's health and his great work in fighting as a patient's advocate. I will submit for the record a statement from Dr. Norwood in support of this legislation.

Second, I would like to thank the staff of both of the committees, as well as Dr. Norwood's office and personal staff, for their work to make this bill a reality.

This legislation would allow a procedure commonly known as paired donation to be legal, to make that clear, and to provide hope to patients waiting for kidney transplants. Paired organ donation will make it possible for thousands of people who wish to donate a kidney to a spouse, a family member or a friend but find that they are medically incompatible to still become living kidney donors.

This is very important, because, as of February 23, we had over 70,000 patients who are now on the waiting list for a kidney transplant, and yet we performed only 16,500 kidney transplants in 2005, of which only 6,500 were living kidney donors. H.R. 710 will take a significant step towards reducing the number of patients on the waiting list and giving many more the hope that their wait will not be endless.

Further, this bill is supported by numerous medical organizations, including the United Network for Organ Sharing, the American Society of Transplant Surgeons, the American Society of Transplantation, the National Kidney Foundation and the American Society of Pediatric Nephrology.

I have sort of a local person who gives me advice about this, Dr. Connie Davis, who is a transplant expert, a physician, and she says that this bill is a huge step forward for the transplant community as clinical efforts in the direction of paired donation have been severely hampered by concerns over the legal status of such activity.

I believe it is imperative that we make it clear that there is no intent by Congress to bar this procedure. It is my hope that the Senate will act quickly on this. Simply put, we want this legislation to save lives immediately.

So, for the 70,000 patients waiting for lifesaving kidney transplants, with time spent on costly and often arduous

dialysis treatment, their time on the waiting list can be significantly shortened with passage and implementation of this bill.

It is an honor to stand here working for the name of Dr. Charlie Norwood. I want to thank all those who have worked on this bill, and I hope very shortly we can have this on the President's desk and help those 70,000 people to a healthy future and great productive years, just like Dr. Norwood had in the U.S. Congress.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE CHARLIE NORWOOD

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 710, the Living Kidney Organ Donation Clarification Act. This bill will explicitly state that Americans in need of a kidney will have a greater chance of receiving one through the process of paired donation.

Over 70,000 Americans are currently in need of a kidney transplant. As a result of significant demand and limited supply, most transplantees wait for over four years before receiving a kidney. Four years for their lives to be saved or lost.

During this time, if their kidneys fail, End Stage Renal Disease can set in. These patients must undergo dialysis. While dialysis extends patients' lives, their condition often prevents them from being fully engaged in their community and career. Dialysis is life-extending, but not life-bettering.

Sadly, in many cases, this is where patients lose their battle. In 2004 alone, 3,823 transplant candidates died awaiting a kidney. As our population ages, that figure is going to increase.

Mr. Speaker, medical science has enabled us to perform more successful organ transplants than ever before. These transplants give patients a new lease on life. Many Members in this body or their loved ones have been touched by the lifesaving gift of organ donation, myself included.

Kidney transplants from living donors tend to be highly successful, but in many cases, those who want to give a kidney to a loved one feel they cannot help because they are not biologically compatible with the patient in need.

H.R. 710 is very simple. It clarifies that paired donation is legal under the National Organ Transplant Act. As a result, a pair consisting of a kidney transplant candidate and an incompatible living donor can be matched with another such incompatible pair to enable two transplants that otherwise would not occur.

Remember those 3,823 souls and ask yourself—could you justify not allowing a process of simply cross-matching to save their lives?

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation in memory of those who have died waiting for a kidney as well as the thousands of Americans who are seeking a transplant or trying to become a living donor to save a loved one's life.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank Chairman DINGELL and Subcommittee Chairman PALLONE and Ranking Member DEAL and Congressman INSLEE for expediting consideration of this specific piece of legislation.

As I have pointed out earlier on the House floor after notification of Congressman Norwood's passing, he wrote me a letter the last day he was in Washington before he flew home to Georgia, and this particular piece of legislation was the primary issue in that letter. It is very, very heartwarming, and I am very grateful that the majority would move this piece of legislation as quickly as they have done. I want to thank them sincerely for doing that.

As has been pointed out, this piece of legislation will be called the Charlie Norwood Living Kidney Organ Donation Clarification Act, and it is in honor of Congressman Norwood, the late Congressman from the Tenth District of Georgia.

There are over 78,000 Americans who need kidney transplants. The average wait is over 4 years. Paired donation can create greater access to kidney transplants. A paired donation consists of a transplant candidate and an incompatible living donor who are matched with another similar pair so as to enable two transplants that would otherwise not occur.

The legislation before us today clarifies the ability to perform paired transplantations through the National Organ Transplant Act, or NOTA. This legislation clarifies that paired donations are not considered a valuable consideration.

This legislation has received the strong support of all the major transplant organizations, including the United Network for Organ Sharing, the American Society of Transplantation, the Association of Organ Procurement Organizations, the National Kidney Foundation, the American Society of Pediatric Nephrology, the Cedars Sinai Health Systems, Johns Hopkins, and the American Society of Transplant Surgeons.

As a consequence of the legislation that Congressman Norwood and Congressman INSLEE have crafted, we assume that at least an additional 2,000 organ transplants a year will occur. That is truly a gift of living that will keep on giving for many, many years to come.

This legislation, unfortunately, will be the last of many great pieces of legislation that Congressman Norwood helped to pass when he was a colleague of ours in this body. He was a true statesman and sincerely a warm, personal friend of mine. I will miss him greatly.

Before I yield back, I want to tell a story about Charlie and then read something into the RECORD.

Congressman Norwood always considered himself to be very prepared. He was always ready for almost any contingency.

The night that we voted the Medicare Modernization Act part D prescription drug benefit on this floor will be a time that will long be remembered because it was such a close vote and it took so long to get it passed. Charlie and my-

self and three other members of the Energy and Commerce Committee on the Republican side had been a part of a group to craft an alternative program for the part D prescription drug benefit. Some of our alternative program was in the final legislation, but not all of it. As a consequence, Charlie was listed as a "lean no." He was in reality a "hard no," but he listed himself as a "lean no."

As we all know, when the climactic vote occurred, there weren't enough yesses on the board to pass it. So I went to one of the senior leaders of the majority party, I am not going to say which one, but I went to one of the senior leaders and I said, "I think we can get Charlie Norwood to vote for this bill." They said, "No, you're not going to get Charlie to vote for the bill." I said, "I think we can, if you'll talk to him."

So I went to Charlie and I said, "Would you talk?" Charlie said, "I don't want to talk to anybody. I'm going to vote against the bill."

I went back and forth. I finally arranged a meeting back in the Republican cloakroom where Charlie would discuss this particular piece of legislation.

Now, he had been a no, no, no, no, no for the last 2 weeks. So when I finally got the two parties together, Norwood immediately pulled out a list from his pocket. Now, he is deceased, so whatever the statute of limitations is has expired. And this Congressman, who had been a lean no, lean no, lean no, had a list of 10 things, 10, that if the senior leadership on the Republican side would consider, he would consider voting for the bill. Ten.

Obviously, that discussion didn't go too far, so he ended up voting no. But he was prepared, and he had a list of things.

Now, in that same sense of being prepared, Mr. INSLEE has already put into the RECORD Congressman Norwood's statement on this bill. Isn't that amazing? I am going to read it into the RECORD. This is the floor statement in support of this bill by the late Congressman Charlie Norwood of the 10th District of Georgia.

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also offer a sincere thank you to Ranking Member BARTON, Chairman DINGELL and Mr. INSLEE for all of their help moving this bill. Committee staff, including Katherine Martin, John Ford and Peter Goodloe should be acknowledged for their aid as well. A special thank you to Nick Shipley with Mr. INSLEE's office who worked with J.P. from my staff from day one as a tireless advocate to get this bill into law.

"It has been said that common sense is the knack of seeing things as they are and doing things as they ought to be done. Well, let me tell you how things were being done. For years, people missed or were delayed in an opportunity to have a life-saving kidney transplant simply because a member of the executive branch couldn't grasp the

true intent of the National Organ Transplant Act's valuable consideration clause. The valuable consideration clause was meant to outlaw the buying and selling of organs, which everyone agrees is proper.

"Now, there are two types of transplant donors, living and cadaveric, or deceased. As a lung transplant recipient, I benefited from the latter, but in the case of the first, a friend or a relative wanting to spare their loved ones from death or dialysis graciously offers to give up one of their kidneys. Regardless of the method, both patient and donor must be biologically compatible.

"In recent years doctors discovered that by using the simple database methods that we use in our everyday lives and business, a paired donation could take place with these living donors.

"In the process of a kidney paired donor transplant, a pair consisting of a kidney transplant candidate and an incompatible living donor is matched with another such incompatible pair to enable two transplants that otherwise would not occur.

"Now, I'm just an old country dentist, but isn't this just common sense? I want to give to someone, but I'm not compatible, but I can give to another patient. Their willing, yet also incompatible, friend can give to my loved one. As a result, two people live; two more slots are opened on the list for even more transplants to take place. Common sense, Mr. Speaker.

"However, instead of every single transplant center undertaking this commonsense approach, some folks were denied the chance to be cross-matched and, instead, their loved one suffered and even died while awaiting a transplant.

"73,652. That is roughly the number, Mr. Speaker, of people waiting for a kidney transplant. I can't imagine looking at any of those people and telling them 'I am sorry, some bureaucrat 10 years ago inspired fear around the simple process to save you today, so you will have to languish on the list and hope for the best.'

"I will tell you what: That is hogwash. Times have changed. Paired donation is saving lives today and will save even more once we get this bill done. H.R. 710 has the support of every major transplant organization, from the United Network for Organ Sharing, who will manage the national list, to the surgeons who will perform the transplants, to the patient advocates to the hospitals.

"In fact, a study published in the *Journal of Transplantation* predicts a 14 percent increase in the live kidney donor transplants performed each year if paired donation were allowed. Moreover, for each patient who receives a kidney, Medicare will save \$220,000 in dialysis costs.

"In fact, Johns Hopkins just did a five-way paired donation where five people were saved instead of being put on the waiting list. Now imagine the

good a national list will do. Thousands will be saved through simple common sense. Paired donation is the way things ought to be done.

"How often can we stand in this well on this floor and know what we are doing will save the government money, improve patient quality of life and save lives? Not too often, Mr. Speaker. I can testify to that.

"What the bureaucracy has failed to correct, this Congress will now step up and take care of, unfortunately for all of those who have not been able to benefit, not a minute too soon.

"I yield back the balance of my time."

That is the floor statement of the late Congressman Norwood on a bill that, at the time he prepared this, he wasn't sure would get to the floor.

□ 1430

Yet because of his tenacity and preparedness and the willingness of Mr. DINGELL and Mr. INSLEE and Mr. PALLONE and Speaker PELOSI, the bill is on the floor. I would urge all of my colleagues to support this bill. I do intend to ask for a rollcall vote and let us leave a living legacy of life for the late Congressman Charlie Norwood.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. BARTON for reading Dr. Norwood's eloquent statement into the RECORD.

I want to note that kidney donation is not just for the recipients. It is for their families and the places they work, and even the U.S. Congress. The reason we had the benefit of Dr. Norwood's wisdom for years in the U.S. Congress was because of a lung transplant. I want to note that what we are doing today is not only helping those 70,000 people, but also their families and workplaces and the whole U.S. economy.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL), the ranking member of the Health Subcommittee.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time.

I too wish to express appreciation to the sponsor and all of those who have made it possible to bring this bill to the floor today. It is certainly altogether fitting and proper that we name this bill after the late Charlie Norwood.

This bill does two very important things that Charlie really believed in. The first is he believed in organ transplant. As Mr. INSLEE alluded, he was the recipient of a lung transplant that extended his life. He believed in organ transplants.

The second thing that it does is something that he really believed in as well, and that is overcoming bureaucratic red tape that made no common sense. And that is what this bill does.

Pairing of donations for kidneys makes all of the common sense in the world. It will save lives and money. Certainly in the tradition of Charlie Norwood, it will perpetuate the importance of organ donations and do so in the memory and in the honor of a great Member of this body.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I would yield to the dean of the House whose leadership helped bring this bill to the floor today, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), for such time as he may consume.

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have said strongly why this is a good piece of legislation and why it should be enacted. I strongly support it, and I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 710, the Charlie W. Norwood Living Organ Donation Act. I am delighted that the Commerce Committee could report this good piece of legislation to the House floor, and I am pleased by the consequences of it because we will achieve more help to those in need of organ donation, something which is of great importance to the country and to those who are in such grave and serious need.

Charlie Norwood wanted this bill very badly. It is a good bill. We are delighted that we could bring to the House floor a good bill which not only does good but which honors its author, Charlie Norwood, by carrying forward his goals, his purposes, and his intentions with regard to helping his fellow Americans. I am delighted we can do this for Charlie Norwood who was a valuable member of the committee and who will indeed be missed by his colleagues in Congress on both sides of the aisle.

I have a longer statement which will appear in the RECORD which I believe sets forth some of the things already said by my colleagues. I thank my good friend, the manager of the bill on this side, and the former chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), my dear friend, for their leadership on this matter.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 710, the "Charlie W. Norwood Living Organ Donation Act."

Representative Charlie Norwood was a dear friend and colleague of mine. Beginning in 1995, Charlie served the people of the tenth district of Georgia admirably and honorably in the House of Representatives. Sadly, Charlie lost his long battle with cancer on February 13, 2007, but he shall not be forgotten and we will pass this legislation in his honor.

H.R. 710 would modify the National Organ Transplant Act (NOTA) to clarify that "paired" kidney donations do not violate a clause of the act regarding "valuable consideration," which outlaws the buying or selling of kidneys and other organs.

A "paired" donation occurs when a donor who is willing to give a kidney to a family member or friend, but is biologically incompatible, donates to another patient, who also has an incompatible donor. By cross-matching two

or more incompatible donor-recipient pairs, more patients can receive kidneys and more donors can give them.

Currently, an estimated 6,000 individuals nationwide have offered kidneys to family members and friends, only to have the donation rejected because they are incompatible. Many providers will not perform paired donations, however, for fear of violating NOTA. If paired donations were allowed, a study published in the *Journal of Transplantation* by Johns Hopkins Hospital and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology predicts that there would be a 14 percent increase in the number of live kidney donor transplants performed each year.

The controversy over paired organ donation began with an interpretation by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) stating that paired donation MAY be in violation of NOTA's valuable consideration clause. The clause was intended to outlaw the buying or selling of transplantable human organs. This stigma against paired donation elicits concern within some areas of the transplant community, which desperately wants clear legislative guidance on this issue.

This legislation is supported by leading organ donation and organ transplant organizations such as the National Kidney Foundation, the American Society of Transplantation, the American Society of Transplant Surgeons, the Association of Organ Procurement Organizations, the Organization for Transplant Professionals, and the United Network for Organ Sharing (UNOS).

Paired transplantation is a way to solve the dilemma faced by people who want to become living organ donors for a family member or friend, but are unable to do so because they are biologically incompatible. And one of the added benefits of this bill is that it produces savings. Since Dr. Norwood was dedicated to making sure that physicians were treated right and paid properly, we will be using this savings to do just that.

I would like to sincerely thank Representatives Norwood and INSLEE for their leadership, dedication, and diligent work on this important legislation. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in strong support of H.R. 710, the "Charlie W. Norwood Living Organ Donation Act."

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Before I yield to Dr. GINGREY, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan for his excellent leadership and his willingness to expedite this process. It is because of JOHN DINGELL that this bill is on the floor this afternoon. We on the minority are very appreciative of that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

(Mr. GINGREY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for recognizing me, and I have a longer speech that I want to submit for the RECORD. I think my staff must have been looking over the ranking member's shoulder when they wrote it. He has already said those nice things about our good friend, Charlie Norwood.

I was touched, though, in the letter that he received and read, the phrases "hogwash" and an "old country den-

tist." I was sitting here thinking, I can see Charlie saying those things on this floor. That is the way he was and that is the way we remember him. He wasn't an old country dentist, let me assure you. He was a prosperous dentist in Augusta, Georgia, a population of 130,000, the home of the Masters; but that was Charlie.

Let me join JOE BARTON, the ranking member, in thanking Chairman DINGELL. I mentioned this bill to the chairman last week, and he looked at me and said, Doc, and he had a little mist of tear in his eye, he said, Don't worry about this; we are going to do this. And I knew then that the chairman and Representative INSLEE and others were fully supportive of what Charlie was trying to do.

If he was thinking just of himself, Mr. Speaker, this bill probably would say the Living Lung Organ Donation Act, which also would be possible; but that wasn't Charlie. He was thinking about those 70,000 other people who are waiting for a kidney.

Charlie himself had to wait a long time to get that lung. Too long, we think. I don't know if it would have saved his life if he would have had an opportunity for a paired living lung donor, but he was thinking of others who were suffering, and as others have said, to bring a commonsense solution to problem solving in a bipartisan way. They described Charlie as a dog that has got ahold of a bone and won't let it go. Well, we can say to Charlie today, as part of our legacy to him, that he has succeeded.

Mr. Speaker, let's support this bill as a legacy and tribute to the great Member, Charlie Norwood.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation honors a dear friend and former colleague in this body, the late Congressman Charlie Norwood. Charlie worked tirelessly as an advocate for patients across our Nation, and this bill is a fitting tribute to the tremendous impact he's made on healthcare in America.

Mr. Speaker, in this country, there are more than 74,000 men, women and children on the waiting list for a kidney transplant. Unfortunately, if the current trend of kidney transplants continues, only about half of these candidates will ever receive a life-saving transplant. Tragically, in 2004, nearly 4,000 listed patients died while awaiting a kidney.

One way for individuals to avoid the kidney transplant waiting list all together is to find a living donor, like a friend or family member who is willing to selflessly donate a kidney to save a loved one. The limitation on this compassion is that only compatible matches can donate kidneys; if your friends and family are not a match, they can't be your donor.

But those of us who knew Charlie know that he was an excellent problem solver, always turning challenges into opportunities. With the limited donor options individuals face within their community of family and friends, patient advocates and healthcare providers have pushed for living organ donors. Charlie was convinced of the unlimited potential that could be realized when the pool of living donors would be expanded beyond one's immediate family and friends. In fact, there have been

success stories of hospitals doing just this—finding pairs of living kidney donors who aren't matches for their own loved ones, but are matches for someone else's loved one.

Unfortunately, due to conflicting interpretations of the National Organ Transplant Act, hospitals across the country are hesitant to make this type of procedure a rule—and this where the Charlie Norwood Living Kidney Organ Donation Act will create miracles.

H.R. 710 would clarify in statute that this type of paired living kidney donation would be allowed under Federal law. This will alleviate the concerns of hospitals and healthcare providers that want to give all kidney patients the hope that transplants represent but ambiguity in law currently prevents.

Mr. Speaker this is a win-win situation. More patients would benefit from a kidney transplant, thereby reducing the number of individuals on the waiting list. In turn, more Americans—both on the waiting list and off—will have that miraculous second chance at life.

Mr. Speaker, passing this legislation will be a lasting tribute to Charlie Norwood's selfless efforts to help those in need. While we all wish our friend's lung transplant had saved his life, we can honor him by giving Americans across our Nation greater access to the potential miracle of an organ donation.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to another distinguished member of the Georgia delegation, Congressman John Linder.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in support of the underlying legislation, and in support of the memory and legacy of its author, my friend and colleague, Charlie Norwood.

Many people may remember the story of Nicholas Greene, the 17-year-old boy who was killed during a family vacation in Italy. The tragic and sudden loss of this young boy was turned into a story of hope and love when his parents generously donated his organs. Out of his tragic death sprang life, as seven people received Nicholas' heart, liver, kidneys, corneas, and pancreatic cells.

If there is one lesson we can take from Nicholas' great gift to the world and from the strong humanitarian legacy of Charlie Norwood, it is that we must support life whenever we have that opportunity.

H.R. 710 specifically excludes kidney-paired donation from the National Organ Transplant Act's valuable consideration clause. The valuable consideration clause has a noble purpose, which is to keep people from buying and selling human organs. In the case of kidney-paired donation, which is held to the highest of medical ethical standards, that purpose is obstructing the ability to save lives. By supporting this bill, we can give countless people a better chance for survival.

Let me be clear: paired-organ donation does not constitute the buying or selling of organs. If we believe as much, then we accept the idea that the gift of life has a monetary value. Charlie vehemently opposed this concept, and so should we.

Thousands of people die each year waiting on a transplant list, praying for the right match for a kidney. Paired donation will significantly increase the number of available kidneys each year, allowing even more people to live productive, healthy lives.

H.R. 710 honors the memory of our friend Charlie Norwood, it honors the memory of Nicholas Greene and his family, and it honors all those Americans who have lost their lives while waiting on a transplant list. As such, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in passing this critically important vehicle for giving the gift of life to others.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to make a point. I think this is a great bipartisan success, to try to improve organ donation prospects for these 70,000 Americans. But we have more work to do. This bill is not the end of our efforts. I worked for 2 years with MIKE BILIRAKIS, a great Republican, to try to have people in hospitals work with families on transplant donation issues. We need to fund that bill, and I hope we can have a bipartisan effort to do that.

We have work to do to fund immunosuppressant drugs. Right now, we are not funding the drugs that donees need to suppress the immunological response to donation.

So I hope we can continue to work in a bipartisan fashion to help these 70,000 Americans. We will remember Charlie Norwood's efforts in this regard and on future successes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to another distinguished member of the Georgia delegation, Jack Kingston from Savannah.

Mr. KINGSTON. Thank you, Mr. BARTON, and I thank Dr. BURGESS for letting a noncommittee member go first. I appreciate the courtesy; and I wanted to thank Mr. INSLEE for his help on this bill and all of the work and leadership by both parties on this.

If Charlie Norwood were here today, he would be sitting there and he would be embarrassed. He would be deflecting all of these sweet things that are being said about him. But if this bill was controversial and was having a tough fight, Charlie Norwood would be right in the middle of it and pushing it along and making sure it got done and standing up for the folks outside the 70,000-plus folks who are in line for an organ transplant right now. That is who he always answered to.

I remember the Norwood-Dingell bill on the Patients' Bill of Rights, how he did not appreciate the leadership in our party's position on it, so he went out and found alternative ways to get it done. And in that case, he cobbled together a bipartisan group of Democrats and Republicans to push his Patients' Bill of Rights because Charlie Norwood was a fighter, and he was always a fighter for a good cause. So it is fitting and proper for him to be recognized in this bill.

A couple of weeks ago I was at the University of Georgia, which is located in Athens, my hometown and in Charlie Norwood's district. And I met with Dr. Steve Stice. He told me he is doing a lot of work on stem cell, and he casually mentioned that the University of Georgia had cloned about 50 cattle and sheep. I could not believe they had cloned that many.

But as I listened to him and all of the technological breakthroughs that are happening in the world of science and medicine today, I think what lies out there in organ transplant, we have not even scratched the surface. There will be medical revolutions in the years to come because of the technology that is out there.

So our laws and what we are doing today is keeping the law current with the technology and with the science. That is why it is a good thing to do this. Think about Floyd Spence, our colleague from South Carolina, who had a lung transplant for 12 years, and our brave Charlie Norwood. Think about what they do; they educate the rest of us.

Our day in office for all of us will end. Either politically or biologically or for whatever reason, but what a great thing it is to have that service time in the House be used to hold a baton high that you can pass on to the next generation and have true national impact. That is what we are doing here today.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. How much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I, unfortunately, can only yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), a member of the committee.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. BARTON for the time, and I thank Chairman DINGELL for bringing this bill to the floor. This is a wonderful legacy for Charlie Norwood. Charlie was all about clarification and common sense. We miss him on the committee. Personally, he was my mentor and had seen me through many issues on the committee. But I can think of no more fitting way to close out the legacy of Charlie Norwood than with this act that brings clarification to Federal law and allows paired donations to proceed apace.

Charlie Norwood, from life hereafter, has reached back to this House and delivered one last dose of common sense. Thank you, Charlie.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, could I ask unanimous consent for 3 additional minutes to tell one last Charlie Norwood story.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

□ 1445

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, before I close, since we have painted

Charlie Norwood to be such a saint today, I have got to kind of get a little bit truer picture of him.

In the Energy Policy Act debate of 2005, there was a provision in the bill that was not controversial in the overall part of the bill, but it was very controversial in certain areas of the country. One of those areas was in Charlie's area of the southeast.

I had been working with him all through the debate to try to get him to help me forge a compromise on this particular issue, and he agreed that the compromise was the best public policy, but it wasn't the policy that his region supported. So he was in a difficult position of agreeing with me, the chairman, on what the good public policy was, but knowing that that was not a vote that he would be supported in taking for his region.

I went round and round with him about how to convince him to support this particular item in the bill, and he just flat couldn't do it. But I finally got him to agree that, at the critical moment, he would not be there to vote against it. In other words, he would be absent, meeting a constituent or something, and he just couldn't be there. He and I agreed on this, and our staffs had worked it out so that when the time came to vote, Mr. Norwood would not vote "no," which would make me happy, but he wouldn't vote "yes" either, which would have made me even happier. He just wouldn't vote.

So, sure enough, the critical moment came, and the vote occurred. True to his word, Charlie Norwood was not around, but as soon as I gavelled the vote, he burst into the room, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman, could I be recorded. I said, no, the vote has already expired. He said, what kind of hogwash is this and just raised holy cane, purely for theatrical purposes, but you know, the point had been made.

So his constituency felt justified in his support, and I felt justified in he didn't vote against me, and yet he had upstaged his chairman, but in some cases, that was Charlie Norwood.

We rise in support of this bill. It does save money. It saves \$30 million or \$40 million the first year and I think \$400 million to \$500 million over the 10-year scoring period. So we are going to work with the majority to find a way to put these savings to use so, once again, Congressman Norwood not only is doing a good thing, providing a gift to the living, but this piece of legislation, if it becomes law, will also save the taxpayers money.

I would strongly urge a "yes" vote on this bill.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support legislation by Congressman JACK INSLEE that will save thousands of lives by speeding the kidney donation process.

By making paired kidney donation legal, this bill will facilitate the identification of kidney donors and speed the process by which donors are matched with patients. In fact, this bill could increase the number of live kidney donor transplants performed each year by 14

percent according to a study by the Journal of Transplantation.

In addition to the positive effects for kidney transplant patients, speeding the donation process will also help reduce federal spending. According to the Congressional Budget Office, this bill will reduce Medicare spending for dialysis by \$500 million over 10 years.

This legislation has a wide base of support from the medical community, including the United Network for Organ Sharing, the American Society of Transplantation, the Kidney Fund, the Transplant Surgeons, and the Association of Organ Procurement Organizations. I am proud to add my vote of support to this list.

This bill will give much needed hope to the more than 95,000 people who are waiting for a life-saving organ donation. I commend Congressman INSLEE for introducing this important bill.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 710, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 15. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Rotunda of the Capitol to be used on March 29, 2007, for a ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the Tuskegee Airmen.

COMMENDING AND CONGRATULATING VIRGINIA STATE UNIVERSITY ON ITS 125TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 182) commending and congratulating Virginia State University on the occasion of its 125th anniversary, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 182

Whereas Virginia State University, overlooking the Appomattox River in the Town of Ettrick in Chesterfield County, will celebrate its 125th anniversary in 2007;

Whereas Virginia State University (VSU) was founded on March 6, 1882, as the Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute, making it the first fully State-supported 4-year institution of higher learning for black Americans and one of Virginia's two land-grant institutions;

Whereas since its humble beginnings, Virginia State University has responded to the needs of Virginians as a dynamic institution offering an accessible, affordable, quality education;

Whereas with an enrollment of nearly 5,000, VSU students live and attend classes on a beautiful 236-acre main campus with more than 50 buildings, including 15 dormitories, 16 classroom buildings, and a 416-acre agricultural research facility;

Whereas the first president of Virginia State University was John Mercer Langston, who became the first African American elected to Congress from Virginia;

Whereas Virginia State University has an exemplary and dedicated faculty and staff, who are committed to offering their students the personal attention that smaller institutions can offer;

Whereas Virginia State University's academic programs include the Bridges to Baccalaureate program for students transferring from 2-year colleges who want to major in the sciences, the Ronald E. McNair Scholars Program for students planning to pursue doctoral degrees, and the Honda Campus All-Star Challenge;

Whereas Virginia State University offers 45 baccalaureate and master's degree programs within its 5 schools (the School of Agriculture, School of Business, School of Engineering, Science, and Technology, School of Liberal Arts and Education, and the School of Graduate Studies, Research, and Outreach), and a Certificate of Advanced Study may also be earned from each school;

Whereas honors scholarships are available to entering VSU freshmen, including the Presidential and Provost Scholarships;

Whereas in 2003 Virginia State University introduced its first doctoral program and 12 enthusiastic students enrolled in the new Doctor of Education in Administration and Supervision program;

Whereas in 2005 Virginia State University began a vital new nursing degree program, an important initiative that will train nurses to meet the urgent demand for qualified medical professionals in the hospitals and clinics of Southside Virginia;

Whereas the School of Graduate Studies, Research and Outreach allows students, often working adults with diverse professional and educational backgrounds, to more conveniently continue their education on a full-time or part-time basis; the school also provides workshops, seminars, and credit courses on campus and at sites in Richmond, Emporia, Petersburg, Chesterfield, Dinwiddie, Henrico, and other Southside Virginia locations; and

Whereas Virginia State University has a long and rich history and has grown and changed considerably since 1882, and it continues that growth today, enriching individual lives, the surrounding community, and the Commonwealth through excellent teaching and innovative and engaging programs of study: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives commends and congratulates Virginia State University on the occasion of its 125th anniversary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may insert material relevant to H. Res. 182 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 182 is a resolution commending and congratulating Virginia State University on the occasion of its 125th anniversary. H. Res. 182 was introduced by my colleague from Virginia from the Fourth Congressional District of Virginia, Mr. FORBES.

Virginia State University was founded on March 6, 1882, as the Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute, making it the first fully State-supported 4-year institution of higher learning for African Americans. Today, it is one of Virginia's two land-grant institutions.

The first president of Virginia State University was John Mercer Langston who upon his election to Congress in 1890 was the first African American elected to Congress and, until my election in 1992, had been the only African American elected from Virginia.

In 1935, Virginia State University founded a 2-year satellite school at Norfolk, Virginia. That school today is known as Norfolk State University.

Today, Virginia State has an enrollment of nearly 5,000 students who live and learn on a 236-acre main campus overlooking the Appomattox River in Chesterfield County, Virginia. The school also has a 416-acre agricultural research facility.

The University's academic programs include the "Bridges to Baccalaureate" program for students transferring from 2-year colleges who want to major in science, as well as the Honda Campus All-Star Challenge and the Ronald E. McNair Scholars Program for students planning to pursue doctoral degrees.

Virginia State has helped set the standard for minority-serving institutions in Virginia and across the Nation by providing quality higher education opportunities for 125 years.

My family has a proud Trojan tradition. My mother attended Virginia State, my older brother is a graduate of Virginia State, and I am honored to have an honorary degree from Virginia State.

So I congratulate Virginia State University on its 125th anniversary and wish them another successful 125 years.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 182, a resolution to recognize the contributions of Virginia State University on the occasion of its 125th anniversary.

I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) and my colleague on the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. SCOTT, for introducing this resolution and recognizing the important role that Virginia State University plays in educating young people from all over the world.

As a historically black college and university, or HBCU, Virginia State University is one of a diverse community of institutions. Historically black colleges and universities include 2- and 4-year institutions, public and private institutions, as well as single-sex and coed institutions. To be designated a historically black college or university, an institution must have been established prior to 1964 with a primary mission of educating African Americans.

Mr. Speaker, HBCUs have a long, proud and well-established heritage. These institutions have been educating the students of this Nation for over 100 years. While comprising fewer than 3 percent of the country's 2- and 4-year institutions, HBCUs are responsible for producing a significant number of all bachelor's, master's and professional degrees earned by African Americans.

Congress has repeatedly recognized the importance of the historically black colleges and universities. Between 1995 and 2006, congressional funding for the Strengthening Historically Black Colleges and Universities Program rose from \$109 million to \$238 million, a 118 percent increase. What is more, funding for the HBCU Grad Program increased from \$19.6 million to \$57.9 million, an increase of 195 percent.

Virginia State University, located in Petersburg, VA, was originally founded on March 6, 1882, as the Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute and was the first fully State-supported 4-year institution of higher education for African Americans and one of Virginia's two land-grant institutions. VSU's first president, John Mercer Langston, went on to become the first African American Member of Congress from the Commonwealth of Virginia.

This school offers 43 undergraduate degree programs and 15 graduate degree programs. The campus is composed of more than 50 buildings, which include a 416-acre agricultural research facility. Since its founding, VSU has grown from a small HBCU to an institution that enrolls just over 5,000 students, 96 percent of whom are African American.

Mr. Speaker, it is for all of these reasons and more that I urge my colleagues to honor the 125th anniversary of Virginia State University and support H. Res. 182.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield as much time as he needs to my colleague from Virginia (Mr. FORBES).

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member MCKEON for their work in getting this resolution to the floor. I also want to thank my friend and colleague, Congressman SCOTT, for his hard work and the work of his staff in getting the bill here and also Congresswoman FOXX for her efforts and her staff in helping to get H. Res. 182 on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today, as do my colleagues, to commend Virginia State University on the celebration of their

125th anniversary. This resolution honors Virginia State University's continued resolve to provide an excellence in education since March 6, 1882.

Mr. Speaker, today we just pause and we say to all of the current students of Virginia State University, to the alumni, to the faculty and to the administration, thank you for a job well done in the pursuit of excellence that you have done for these last 125 years.

As you may know and you have heard mentioned today, Mr. Speaker, Virginia State University is located in my district in Chesterfield County, and it is warmly embraced by the neighboring city of Petersburg. It was the first university to be fully funded by the Commonwealth of Virginia as an institution of higher learning for African Americans.

Currently, Virginia State University offers 45 baccalaureate and master's degree programs and introduced their first doctoral program in 2003. This campus includes 236 acres and an additional 416-acre agriculture research facility. They host nearly 5,000 students and continue to grow.

It fills me with pride to stand on the House floor today to present this resolution. We have had a long-standing relationship with Virginia State University and look forward to continuing this through the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution comes before the House floor cosponsored by the entire Virginia congressional delegation. Though I cannot speak for my colleagues, I believe I can say we are proud of the progress Virginia State University has provided through its 125 years of service to the students in Virginia and beyond. This anniversary represents a significant milestone in the Commonwealth of Virginia's history.

The university is more than worthy of this distinguished recognition for the impressive advancements and accomplishments in their 125-year history, and we are honored to acknowledge their achievements today.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, 125 years ago, Virginia State University was founded. I want to thank my colleague from Virginia for his leadership in introducing this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 182, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1500

AUTHORIZING USE OF ROTUNDA FOR CEREMONY TO AWARD CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR TO THE TUSKEGEE AIRMEN

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 15) authorizing the Rotunda of the Capitol to be used on March 29, 2007, for a ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the Tuskegee Airmen.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. CON. RES. 15

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Rotunda of the Capitol is authorized to be used on March 29, 2007, for a ceremony to award a Congressional Gold Medal collectively to the Tuskegee Airmen in accordance with Public Law 109-213. Physical preparations for the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of Senate Concurrent Resolution 15, which would authorize the use of the Capitol rotunda on March 29, 2007, to present a Congressional Gold Medal to members of the Tuskegee Airmen.

With the passage of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, Tuskegee University, along with various civil rights groups and the black press, began an effort to transform Federal Government policies and procedures that excluded African Americans from pilot training programs.

In this initial phase, Tuskegee Institute, which had a proven civilian pilot training program and had a history of producing graduates with the highest of flight aptitude exam scores, was awarded a contract by the U.S. Army Air Corps to help train America's first black military aviators.

Between 1940 and 1946, nearly 1,000 black pilots were trained at Tuskegee University. This undertaking produced the unrivaled Tuskegee Airmen, who are credited with not losing a single bomber to enemy fire in more than 200 combat missions as air escorts, a record unmatched by any other fighter group.

The Tuskegee Airmen destroyed some 260 enemy aircraft. These brave men accumulated a total of 850 medals for their service and valor. Tuskegee University continues its legacy of leadership in aeronautics.

Today, it is the first and only Historically Black College or University to offer a degree in aerospace science

engineering. Since 1983, it has produced the largest number of black aerospace engineers of any institution in America.

In spite of the adversity and limited opportunities, African Americans have played a significant role in the U.S. Navy and military history. The Tuskegee Airmen overcame segregation and prejudice to become one of the most highly respected fighter groups of World War II.

So on March 29, 2007, the President of the United States will present the Congressional Gold Medal to the survivors expected to attend the ceremony, after which the medal will be given to the Smithsonian Institution and will be displayed in the future as appropriate.

Last year, the House and Senate unanimously passed legislation brought to the floor by the Financial Services Committee to authorize the Congressional Gold Medal, which became Public Law 109-213. The bill had 310 cosponsors in the House and 77 in the Senate. Our colleague, the Honorable CHARLIE RANGEL of New York, has worked tirelessly as the lead House sponsor of this legislation, and he has been the catalyst to ensure that these men got their rightful spot in history.

Since the House Administration Committee has jurisdiction over matters relating to the Smithsonian Institution, I am especially pleased that language was able to be worked out in the bill which would allow the Smithsonian to accept this historic medal on behalf of the American people and to display it as appropriate, including a location associated with the Tuskegee Airmen.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. Con. Res. 15, which authorizes the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for the ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the Tuskegee Airmen.

I would like to thank the distinguished chairman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for sponsoring the House version of this resolution. I would also like to thank my Chair of House Administration for her work as well.

All of our men and women of the armed services deserve our praise and recognition for the contributions they have made in defense of our country. It is notable that in the case of the Tuskegee Airmen they were fighting not one but two battles. As they bravely flew and maintained combat aircraft in World War II, these men also fought against the notion that somehow the color of their skin would affect their ability to courageously protect our Nation.

In 1941, the formation of the all African American squadron based in Tuskegee, Alabama, a group that would come to be known as the Tuskegee Airmen, was largely regarded

as an experiment of the U.S. military to test the combat readiness of the all-black fighting squadron. Sadly, there were some at the time who expected or perhaps even hoped that the experiment would fail. Instead, the Tuskegee Airmen became one of the most highly regarded units of the war, fighting bravely with distinction.

Among the honors bestowed upon them, they were awarded 150 Distinguished Flying Crosses, 744 Air Medals, 14 Bronze Stars, and 8 Purple Hearts. I proudly support authorization of the use of the Capitol rotunda where they will be recognized once more for their bravery and for blazing a trail, not only in the sky, but in the history as well.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from the great State of California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for the ceremony honoring the Tuskegee Airmen with the Congressional Gold Medal. I am pleased that S. Con. Res. 15 is currently under consideration.

As we all know, the Tuskegee Airmen were young men who enlisted to become America's first black military airmen at a time where, sadly in this country, there were many people who argued that black men lacked the necessary skills or ability to be part of an effective military force. Well, the Tuskegee Airmen effectively dispelled that notion that in any way African Americans were second-class citizens.

Mr. Speaker, although the term "hero" is perhaps overused in today's discourse, there is no better description of the Tuskegee Airmen. Not only were they the first black airmen to perform as they did, but they put their lives on the line for all Americans, regardless of color.

For that, we are all eternally grateful and eternally in their debt; and it is not only appropriate, but fitting, for us to take this step today. As one in his younger years who had an opportunity to meet some of these Tuskegee Airmen, I can tell you that they carried themselves with a great deal of pride in the contribution they had made to this Nation, and any conversations I had with such airmen, that is what they stressed, their contribution to this Nation.

So it is fitting that we take the time, as a thankful Nation, to give them this respect and honor them in this singular way with a Congressional Gold Medal and to have this done here at the center, at the heart of our democracy, the rotunda of the United States Capitol.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. On March 29 of this year, this Nation will give to its Americans, rightfully, the Congressional Gold Medal that they deserve.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 78, which authorizes the use of the Capitol Rotunda for a ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the Tuskegee Airmen. I strongly support the resolution because it is an appropriate and fitting tribute to one of the greatest groups of the Greatest Generation.

On July 19, 1941, the American Air Force created an all black flight training program at the Tuskegee Institute in Alabama. The Tuskegee Airmen were not only unique in their military record, but they inspired revolutionary reform in the Armed Forces, paving the way for integration of the Armed Services in the U.S.

The first class of cadets began in July of 1941 with 13 men, all of whom had college degrees, some with PhDs and all had pilot's licenses. From all accounts, the training of the Tuskegee Airmen was an experiment established to prove that "coloreds" were incapable of operating expensive and complex combat aircraft. Stationed in the segregated South, the black cadets were denied rifles.

The Tuskegee Airmen were credited with 261 aircraft destroyed, 148 aircraft damaged, 15,553 combat sorties and 1,578 missions over Italy and North Africa. They destroyed or damaged over 950 units of ground transportation and escorted more than 200 bombing missions. "We proved that the antidote to racism is excellence in performance," said retired LTC Herbert Carter, who started his military career as a pilot and maintenance officer with the Tuskegee Airmen's 99th Fighter Squadron. Clearly, the experiment, as it was called, was an unqualified success.

The Tuskegee Airmen were awarded 3 Presidential Unit Citations, 150 Distinguished Flying Crosses and Legions of Merit, along with The Red Star of Yugoslavia, 9 Purple Hearts, 14 Bronze Stars and more than 700 Air Medals and clusters. On February 28, 2006, the House passed H. Con. Res. 1259, authorizing the award of a Congressional Gold Medal on behalf of the Tuskegee Airmen. The President signed the legislation and it became Public Law 109-213 on April 11, 2006. The concurrent resolution before us authorizes the use of the Capitol Rotunda on March 29, 2007, for the award ceremony.

I would like to thank Congressman RANGEL for his tenacity in seeing to it that the contributions of Tuskegee Airmen are fully recognized and acknowledged by the people of the United States. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the resolution.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 15.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD on Senate Concurrent Resolution 15.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE NEGRO BASEBALL LEAGUES AND THEIR PLAYERS

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 162) recognizing the contributions of the Negro Baseball Leagues and their players, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 162

Whereas even though African Americans were excluded from playing in the major leagues of their time with their white counterparts, the desire of many African Americans to play baseball could not be repressed;

Whereas Major League Baseball did not fully integrate its leagues until July 1959;

Whereas African Americans began organizing their own professional baseball teams in 1885;

Whereas the skills and abilities of Negro League players eventually made Major League Baseball realize the need to integrate the sport;

Whereas six separate baseball leagues, known collectively as the "Negro Baseball Leagues", were organized by African Americans between 1920 and 1960;

Whereas the Negro Baseball Leagues included exceptionally talented players who played the game at its highest level;

Whereas on May 20, 1920, the Negro National League, the first successful Negro League, played its first game;

Whereas Andrew "Rube" Foster, on February 13, 1920, at the Paseo YMCA in Kansas City, Missouri, founded the Negro National League and also managed and played for the Chicago American Giants, and later was inducted into the Baseball Hall of Fame;

Whereas Leroy "Satchel" Paige, who began his long career in the Negro Leagues and did not make his Major League debut until the age of 42, is considered one of the greatest pitchers the game has ever seen, and during his long career thrilled millions of baseball fans with his skill and legendary showboating, and was later inducted into the Baseball Hall of Fame;

Whereas Josh Gibson, who was the greatest slugger of the Negro Leagues, tragically died months before the integration of baseball, and was later inducted into the Baseball Hall of Fame;

Whereas Jackie Robinson, whose career began with the Kansas City Monarchs of the Negro American League, became the first African American to play in the Major Leagues in April 1947, was named Major League Baseball Rookie of the Year in 1947, subsequently led the Brooklyn Dodgers to 6 National League pennants and a World Series championship, and was later inducted into the Baseball Hall of Fame;

Whereas Larry Doby, whose career began with the Newark Eagles of the Negro Na-

tional League, became the first African American to play in the American League in July 1947, was an All-Star 9 times in the Negro Leagues and Major League Baseball, and was later inducted into the Baseball Hall of Fame;

Whereas John Jordan "Buck" O'Neil was a player and manager of the Kansas City Monarchs of the Negro American League, became the first African American coach in the Major Leagues with the Chicago Cubs in 1962, served on the Veterans Committee of the National Baseball Hall of Fame, chaired the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum Board of Directors, and worked tirelessly to promote the history of the Negro Leagues;

Whereas the talents of such players as James Thomas "Cool Papa" Bell and Oscar Charleston earned them recognition in the Baseball Hall of Fame as well as the Sporting News List of Baseball's Greatest Players, but were all denied admission to the Major Leagues due to the color of their skin;

Whereas Minnie Miñoso played in the Negro Leagues for several years before being allowed to play in the Major League and was denied admission to the Hall of Fame, because during his prime years, he was a victim of racial discrimination;

Whereas Autozone Park in Memphis, Tennessee, has been designated to host on March 31, 2007, the inaugural Civil Rights Game between World Series champions, the St. Louis Cardinals and the Cleveland Indians in commemoration of the Civil Rights Movement; and

Whereas by achieving success on the baseball field, African American baseball players helped break down color barriers and integrate African Americans into all aspects of society in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the teams and players of the Negro Baseball Leagues for their achievements, dedication, sacrifices, and contributions to both baseball and our Nation; and

(2) requests that the President issue a proclamation recognizing "Negro Leaguers Recognition Day".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOX) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, in 1872, Bud Fowler became the first African American to enter organized baseball. At the time, *Sporting Life* magazine called him "one of the best general players in the country. If he had had a white face," they said, "he would be playing with the best of them." There were only a handful of black players during that time.

By the end of the 1800s, the door to organized baseball was slammed shut to African Americans, and as a result, in 1920, Andrew "Rube" Foster managed a Negro baseball team and organized seven other team owners to join

him to form the Negro National Baseball League. Mr. Foster is known by many people to be the father of the Negro Baseball League.

For his efforts and contributions to baseball, he was inducted into the National Baseball Hall of Fame in Cooperstown, New York. Since 1920, many teams were formed to expand the Negro Baseball Leagues. He produced many extraordinary players like Satchel Paige, "Cool Papa" Bell, "Double-Duty" Radcliffe, "Groundhog" Thompson and many others.

Presently, there are 278 members of the National Baseball Hall of Fame, 18 whom had played in the Negro League. These greats include Willie Mays and Jackie Robinson, who first played in the Negro Leagues and then entered Major League Baseball.

Indeed, the players in the Negro Leagues were of such high caliber that many of them later moved to other major leagues and enjoyed better statistics playing there than they did in the Negro Leagues.

The opening of the doors of the major leagues to Negro League players often is attributed to Branch Rickey, who made a bold decision to sign Jackie Robinson to play for the Brooklyn Dodgers in 1947. Unfortunately, many owners of Negro baseball teams could not compete in the recruitment and financial compensation for African American players, which later caused many African American teams to fold in the early 1960s.

Some people shake their heads and say that the Negro Leagues' players came along too early. I think "Cool Papa" Bell had it right when he said "they opened the door, just too late."

But then it is never too late to right what has been a wrong, to create equal opportunity and to open the doors for the Luke Easters, the Minnie Minos, the Kirby Picketts, the Barry Bonds, the Frank Thomases, and countless others who have thrilled and delighted us with their skills.

The achievement and success of African American baseball players on the baseball field have helped break down color barriers and integrate African Americans into all aspects of society.

□ 1515

This bill recognizes the teams and the players of the Negro Baseball Leagues for their achievements, their sacrifices, their dedication, and their contributions to baseball and the Nation. I commend the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) for introducing the bill, and I urge its swift passage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 162, which honors the Negro Baseball League.

Those of us who love baseball relish the comparisons between players of different eras that our rich statistical records permit. Nobody who witnessed

Hank Aaron, a Negro League alum, break Babe Ruth's home record can deny the impact that feat had on the game and on society.

The shame of racism, which afflicts our country even today, prevents us from properly assessing the place in the game of Negro League players. We know that some of the greatest players ever to pick up a bat and ball toiled in those leagues. But who was better, Josh Gibson or Johnny Bench? Satchel Paige or Cy Young? Cool Papa Bell or Mickey Mantle? How would the Pittsburgh Crawfords, who had six Hall of Famers, stack up against the 1927 Yankees, the best team of baseball's all-white era?

Baseball today is one of America's most perfect meritocracies. If you can throw 92-mile-per-hour strikes or hit them consistently, there is a place in the game for you.

It wasn't until 1890, when team owners began to see the potential of their product, that black players began to disappear from white teams. And then it wasn't until the mid 1940s when Branch Rickey of the Dodgers decided he would rather beat the Yankees than honor the unspoken agreement to keep black players out of the game that black players returned.

Today we understand as a Nation that talent comes in all shapes, sizes, and colors. Baseball taught us that. Negro League players taught baseball that. For that, Mr. Speaker, we are eternally grateful.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 162.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Representative from Tennessee, Representative STEVE COHEN, have as much time as he might consume.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 162, which recognizes the contributions of Negro Baseball Leagues.

The Negro Baseball Leagues are part of our history when segregation was the rule, segregation was the law. It is an unfortunate, most unfortunate part of America's history, part of a blemish on the soul of America, part of the blemish on the Constitution, on our laws, and the basis of the founding of the country.

No Nation has a more distinguished, honorable, and respected foundation conceived in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and equal justice for all. But in so many institutions it wasn't true, it wasn't real, until about the 1960s. The work of a great Democratic Congress and President Johnson and others, Republicans as well in a bipartisan move, overcame and repealed Jim Crow laws and passed amendments and laws that allowed people to use public facilities and to have integration in this country and to give everybody the American Dream, which had been denied for over 200 years in this country.

The baseball leagues that were reserved for Negroes were an example of that. There were great players who didn't have the opportunity to perform and achieve until integration. Branch Rickey of the Dodgers brought Jackie Robinson up in the 1940s, and there were great players that didn't have that opportunity.

I want to tell you one story about one particular baseball player who is in this resolution. He is in this resolution because he deserves to be in any resolution about baseball, about discrimination, and about kindness, Minnie Minoso. Minnie Minoso was a Cuban, African Cuban, who came to this country. I guess he would be an African American.

Minnie Minoso started his career in the Negro League, and didn't get to the Major Leagues until he was about 28 or 29 years of age. He had a great career. He led the American League in triples and doubles and stolen bases, one time in RBIs, received three or four Golden Glove awards, named to the All-Star games many, many times, and had statistics with home runs and batting average at nearly .300 for his career that should have qualified him for the Hall of Fame. But he hasn't gotten into the Hall of Fame, and he is not going to get in the Hall of Fame because he wasn't allowed to start in Major League Baseball until he was 28 or 29 because of discrimination.

Well, in 1955, at a spring training game in Memphis, Tennessee, at Russwood Park, I went to a ball game in Memphis. I had had polio the previous year, and I attended the game with my White Sox cap and White Sox T-shirt, on crutches. A player came up to me and offered me a baseball; I was down by the railing trying to get them. The player was named Tom Poholsky, who was white. And I thanked him, but he told me, You shouldn't thank me. You should thank that player over there, number 9, Minoso. Minoso gave Poholsky the ball and wanted me to have it. But because of segregation in this country, Minnie Minoso, one of 60 players, they hadn't cut the rosters yet for spring training, was the only player who had the kindness in his heart to see somebody who was a ball fan who couldn't play at the time because he was on crutches. But in a segregated South, he couldn't give me that ball. He couldn't have a decent act of kindness because of segregation.

Well, I got the ball, and I went down with my dad and we got to know Minnie Minoso, and it started a friendship that has continued to this day. Minnie Minoso was a class act, a wonderful human being who goes beyond baseball, the most popular player ever to wear a White Sox uniform, and a person who has given his life to baseball. But because of the denial of segregation, not allowing him to play in the Major Leagues until he was 28 or 29, he will not get the respect he is due, just like other players in the Negro Leagues didn't. So many of them who were

great players, who would have led the majors in stolen bases, in doubles, in triples, in home runs, in RBIs, or average, as shown over the years by great players like Maury Wills and Bob Gibson and so many other great players who got the opportunity to play and show they could perform.

This year in Memphis on March 31, the major leagues are having a civil rights game. The last exhibition game of the season will be in Memphis at Auto Zone Park; it will be the Cleveland Indians and the St. Louis Cardinals play. There will be a special luncheon the day before the game where the widows of Roberto Clemente and Buck O'Neal will be honored, as well as Spike Lee, for contributions that baseball and civil rights have given to the growth of this country.

It is somewhat ironic in a way that we now see what baseball did to help integrate our country. And this resolution, which is part of the process of showing what this country has gone through, is about a time when we had segregation. Baseball helped integrate society. It helped get little young white kids to appreciate black players and see simple acts of kindness and see the absurdity of segregation. It gave me the opportunity in 1961 in Memphis to go to the Lorraine Hotel, then an all-Negro institution, and see a hero and other players like Walter Bond and Dick Powell staying in the segregated black hotel when the Caucasian players were at the Peabody, and see how ridiculous is this that my hero, an All-Star, a Golden Glove award winner, has to stay at the Lorraine Hotel which was not up to standards.

Baseball has come a long way. The Negro Leagues did a lot to give entertainment to Negroes and Caucasians who went to those games, and gave players an opportunity to play. And it is unfortunate they had to exist, but they did. They gave these players a great opportunity, from Josh Gibson, the great catcher, Satchel Paige, Buck O'Neal, and so many others who are enshrined in the Hall of Fame in Kansas City where there is a Negro League Baseball museum. But they also gave this country the opportunity to look at segregation for what it was, stupid, ignorant, retarded, and gave a process by which we overcame.

Sports have been a great vehicle to overcome discrimination and prejudice, and it was done in baseball, through heroic works by Branch Rickey, heroic at the time of Jackie Robinson who took all kinds of taunts. Now there is a Hall of Fame and there are players in there of both races, and you get there by talent. And that needs to happen all throughout this society and all throughout this country.

I was pleased to bring this resolution because of my experience with Minnie Minoso, my love of baseball, and the fact that baseball gave me an exposure to the horrors of segregation and what it did to my hero and a man who was kind to me through the years, Minnie

Minoso. But there were so many others. I went to games at Martin Stadium in Memphis, which is the home of the Memphis Red Sox, and it was all Negro players. They were great players. They didn't get an opportunity to show their skills. They later did.

I urge all my colleagues to support House Res. 162, recognizing the contributions of the Negro Baseball League, but at the same time reflect on how sad it was that there had to be a Negro Baseball League, and to reflect upon the need to make amends, not just to African Americans who were enslaved by this country's laws and limited and punished and enslaved by Jim Crow laws, but at the same time to think about the greatness of our country and mend a fault and a tear in our Constitution and our soul and civic justice, and put it together and apologize for slavery and Jim Crow, and make our country more whole and do the right thing. When you are wrong, you apologize. When you do evil, you do apologize, and you move forward. They are different bills, and I hate to mix them, but they are all part of the same story.

America needs to move forward, and progress has been made. We need to appreciate the past, but see where we were and move forward. And I am honored to be with the other sponsors of this bill, I think there are hundreds of them, and recognize the contributions of the Negro Baseball League and the story that baseball has played, and ask everybody in America to pay attention on March 31 to the final exhibition game of the season which will be televised on ESPN, a civil rights game that will highlight the civil rights heroes through sports, where Julian Bond will speak at a luncheon at the Peabody Hotel and tell a story of integration and success through sports that came too late in this country's history.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from the State of Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS).

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to come over and speak on this, but the gentleman from Tennessee's eloquence moved me to also add my support for this resolution. I supported it through the committee process. But to also recognize the contributions of the players, the Josh Gibsons, the Buck O'Neals who, because of the bars of segregation at the time, were never allowed to participate in what we now know as the Major Leagues.

But this resolution speaks to the fact that their contributions, that their activities and their records are also an important part of American history and of baseball history, and they should be remembered for their contributions. And that is what this resolution does. In their own ways, they are not only great players, great all-stars, great performers, and great athletes, but they also were pioneers. And I am proud to be here to support the gentleman's resolution.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 162, which recognizes the contributions of the Negro Baseball Leagues and their players for their achievements, dedications and sacrifices to baseball and the Nation.

African Americans began to play baseball in the late 1800s on military teams, college teams, and company teams. They eventually found their way to professional teams with white players. Moses Fleetwood Walker and Bud Fowler were among the first to participate. However, racism and "Jim Crow" laws would force them from these teams by 1900. Thus, black players formed their own units, "barnstorming" around the country to play anyone who would challenge them.

In 1920, an organized league structure was formed under the guidance of Andrew "Rube" Foster—a former player, manager, and owner for the Chicago American Giants. In a meeting held at the Paseo YMCA in Kansas City, MO, Foster and a few other Midwestern team owners joined to form the Negro National League. Soon, rival leagues formed in Eastern and Southern states, bringing the thrills and innovative play of black baseball to major urban centers and rural countryside in the U.S., Canada, and Latin America. The Leagues maintained a high level of professional skill and became centerpieces for economic development in many black communities.

In 1945, Major League Baseball's Brooklyn Dodgers recruited Jackie Robinson from the Kansas City Monarchs. Robinson now becomes the first African American in the modern era to play on a Major League roster. While this historic event was a key moment in baseball and civil rights history, it prompted the decline of the Negro Leagues. The best black players were now recruited for the Major Leagues, and black fans followed. The last Negro Leagues teams folded in the early 1960s, but their legacy lives on through the surviving players and the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum.

The Negro Leagues Baseball Museum is extremely significant because it represents many of the outstanding contributions that blacks made to the game of baseball notwithstanding their initial exclusion from the professional baseball league here in this country. The museum was designated America's National Negro Leagues Baseball Museum when the House passed a resolution. The museum, in the 18th and Vine Historic Jazz District, was founded in 1990 to commemorate an era when many of baseball's top players could not perform on the game's biggest stage, the major leagues, but instead made their own history. The museum draws about 60,000 visitors a year who can view evidence of the great contributions made to America's favorite pastime.

The legacy of the Negro Baseball Leagues also lives on through the multitude of great black and Latino players who have contributed greatly to the game of baseball. The contributions of the Negro Baseball League players certainly paved the way for baseball giants such as Jackie Robinson, Hank Aaron, Willie Mays, Roberto Clemente, and Barry Bonds. Hank Aaron is the Major League Baseball homerun record-holder because of the significant role the Negro Baseball Leagues played in the black community. The Negro Baseball

League is not only a great contribution to the black community but also to the Nation and the world.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 162 to recognize the contributions of the Negro Baseball Leagues and their players for their achievements, dedication and sacrifices to baseball and the Nation.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I too want to commend Mr. COHEN for his eloquence, for introducing this resolution; and I urge all Members to support the passage of H. Res. 162, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 162, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF A NATIONAL CHILDREN AND FAMILIES DAY

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 62), supporting the goals and ideals of a National Children and Families Day, in order to encourage adults in the United States to support and listen to children and to help children throughout the Nation achieve their hopes and dreams, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 62

Whereas research shows that spending time together as a family is critical to raising strong and resilient kids;

Whereas strong healthy families improve the quality of life and the development of children;

Whereas it is essential to celebrate and reflect upon the important role that all families play in the lives of children and their positive effect for the Nation's future;

Whereas the fourth Saturday of June is a day set aside to recognize the importance of children and families; and

Whereas the country's greatest natural resource is its children: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress supports the goals and ideals of a National Children and Families Day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

□ 1530

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, the most sacred institution of our society is that of the family. And within the family, its most precious asset, and that is its children. I stand before you today asking that my colleagues support me in

establishing a National Children and Families Day.

President Bush has stated that, "Families instill in our children values; they shape character and are the foundation of a hopeful society." These are the goals for which we strive on National Children and Families Day. It is the intent of the National Children and Families Day to emphasize the importance of loving and stable relationships between parents, communities and children.

I once heard a teacher ask her class, What is the greatest Nation in the world? As the students muttered the names of countries worldwide, she pointed to her head and said, Imagination.

Through National Children and Families Day, I wish to cultivate and encourage the active imaginations of children, for we know that from creative and innovative thinking comes the ability to hope and dream for a brighter future.

Creating an environment that instills important values and builds strong character and provides sound education for our children is a vital national priority. With a firm foundation, children will be better able to face the challenges of the future.

As a legislator, I often find myself thinking of the countless children I represent whom I view as future voting constituents. And I think of how the policies we enact today could hinder or empower them 10, 15 or 20 years from now.

This, Mr. Speaker, is why I urge my colleagues to support National Children and Families Day.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, with so many distractions in our lives today, it is important to take a step back to acknowledge the central role that families play in the development of our Nation's youth. This resolution celebrates those aspects found in a positive family atmosphere which promotes healthy and well-adjusted young men and women.

It is true that the children are our future, and the strength of our country has been and will continue to be built on families providing educational, social, ethical and moral guidance to our children.

The devotion of time is one of the most important things we can do to help maintain a positive family environment. And while it may be difficult to find time in our hectic schedules, things as simple as playing with educational toys, reading together or visiting an age-appropriate museum will stimulate a child's curiosity that will be beneficial throughout their lives.

Also, something as easy as slowing down enough to take the time to listen to one another, maybe by having dinner as a family whenever possible is a time tested way to nurture a child

through family participation during their formative years.

Young people are increasingly exposed to the stress and pressures of our modern society. In order to combat these negative influences, we must take it upon ourselves, as a society, to expose young people to loving and supporting families whenever possible. As an example, doing a community service project as a family is one of the many ways to teach children that to build a community and to thrive as a society, we should all share in assisting one another.

National Children and Families Day provides us an opportunity to recognize our responsibility to create family environments that nurture the next generation and to promote a positive environment for families across America.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Con. Res. 62.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 62, which supports the goals and ideals of National Children and Families Day. The purpose of H. Con. Res. 62 is to encourage adults to listen to children and to help children throughout the Nation achieve their hopes and dreams, and for other purposes.

As Chair of the Children's Caucus, I strongly believe that we must continue creating positive and effective support systems for our children so that they will become healthy, productive citizens. To do this, we must ensure that all of our children have access to quality education and healthcare. We must also give quality time to our children.

Mr. Speaker, National Children and Families Day encourages parents to spend time with their children and to spend time together around the dinner table.

Our young children are increasingly facing monumental challenges such as drug and alcohol addiction, pregnancy, depression, and obesity. We must invest the time and money in the necessary resources needed to help our children combat these challenges. I recently hosted a briefing, "Childhood Obesity: Factors that are Impacting the Disproportionate Prevalence in Low-Income and Minority Communities," to discuss the causes of, and search for solutions to the childhood obesity epidemic. Eating dinner at the dinner table with parents is one of the suggested ways children may develop healthier eating habits.

According to research by The National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse (CASA) at Columbia University, the more often children eat dinner with their families, the less likely they are to smoke, drink or use drugs. The research suggested that the conversations that go hand-in-hand with dinner will help parents learn more about their children's lives and better understand the challenges they face.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 62 to support the goals and ideals of a National Children and Families Day.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 62.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING THE LIFE AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF LEO T. MCCARTHY AND EXPRESSING PROFOUND SORROW ON HIS DEATH

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 180) honoring the life and achievements of Leo T. McCarthy and expressing profound sorrow on his death.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 180

Whereas Leo McCarthy was born in Auckland, New Zealand, on August 15, 1930;

Whereas Leo McCarthy immigrated to the United States with his parents at the age of three and settled in San Francisco, California;

Whereas Leo McCarthy earned his undergraduate degree from the University of San Francisco and his law degree from San Francisco Law School;

Whereas Leo McCarthy served the United States in an intelligence unit of the Strategic Air Command of the United States Air Force from 1951 to 1952 during the Korean War;

Whereas Leo McCarthy was elected to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 1963 and again in 1967;

Whereas Leo McCarthy was elected to the California Assembly in 1968 and served until 1982;

Whereas Leo McCarthy led the California Assembly with honor and distinction as its Speaker from 1974 until 1980;

Whereas Leo McCarthy instituted reforms in the California Assembly to provide more accountability and greater public access;

Whereas Leo McCarthy was a champion of coastal protection and secured passage of the California Coastal Act;

Whereas Leo McCarthy worked to secure permanent financing for the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) system;

Whereas Leo McCarthy was elected Lieutenant Governor of the State of California three times, serving from 1982 through 1994;

Whereas Leo McCarthy established the Feminization of Poverty Task Force, comprised of women leaders from business executives to former welfare recipients to develop ways to overcome economic barriers that confront women;

Whereas Leo McCarthy helped implement the Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN) program to help welfare recipients move into the workforce;

Whereas Leo McCarthy collaborated with business leaders and advocates to publish "Child Care: The Bottom Line" to educate businesses about the economic and productivity benefits of employer-provided child care;

Whereas Leo McCarthy sponsored the Nursing Home Patients' Protection Act, which made landmark improvements in the treatment of patients in nursing homes;

Whereas Leo McCarthy drafted and sponsored a resolution declaring breast cancer an epidemic in California and called for Federal action;

Whereas Leo McCarthy sponsored the Mammography Quality Assurance Act to create new standards governing mammography facilities and technology;

Whereas Leo McCarthy worked to promote minority and women-owned businesses, publishing and distributing 100,000 copies of the award-winning guide, "Starting and Succeeding in Business: A Special Publication for Small, Minority, and Women-Owned Businesses";

Whereas Leo McCarthy established the Task Force on the Seriously Mentally Ill to develop an alternative service delivery system to assist Californians suffering from severe mental illnesses;

Whereas Leo McCarthy sponsored the Chemical Safety Act to facilitate toxic waste prevention and cleanup;

Whereas Leo McCarthy established the Lieutenant Governor's Commission on the Prevention of Hate Violence to investigate the causes of hate crimes and identify innovative ways of promoting tolerance;

Whereas Leo McCarthy, serving as acting Governor, led the State of California through the initial turmoil of the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake;

Whereas Leo McCarthy served on the University of California Board of Regents and the California State University Board of Trustees;

Whereas Leo McCarthy was twice a candidate for the United States Senate;

Whereas Leo McCarthy was appointed to the National Gambling Impact Study Commission;

Whereas Leo McCarthy was a beloved mentor to generations of public servants;

Whereas Leo McCarthy founded the Leo T. McCarthy Center for Public Service and the Common Good at the University of San Francisco;

Whereas Leo McCarthy was, for 51 years, the beloved husband of Jacqueline Burke McCarthy;

Whereas Leo McCarthy was the father of two daughters and two sons, and grandfather of 11;

Whereas Leo McCarthy earned the highest respect of the people of California for his record of accomplishment on their behalf; and

Whereas the House of Representatives has learned of the death of Leo McCarthy on February 5, 2007: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses its profound sorrow and deep condolences to the McCarthy family on the occasion of the death of Leo McCarthy on February 5, 2007; and

(2) directs the Clerk of the House of Representatives to transmit a copy of this resolution to the family of Leo McCarthy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, public service is the cornerstone of living democracy. That said, I do fervently believe it takes a special person to give

their life to serve the public. I stand before you to honor an individual who, for over 30 years, dedicated his life to public servitude, former California Lieutenant Governor, Leo T. McCarthy.

Lieutenant Governor McCarthy was one who valued what was best for all of Californians, not just those that were of means and access. Much of this can be attributed to McCarthy's humane beginnings as the child of a poor immigrant family. It was during the time McCarthy's father, Daniel, opened a pub which became the community haven for the local Irish Catholic population, that young McCarthy became smitten with service. In his youth, McCarthy engaged in many service-oriented activities, which included early studies for the priesthood and service within the United States Air Force.

After earning his law degree, he began a career in politics that spanned over three decades. He served first as a member of the California Board of Supervisors and, in 1968, won a State assembly seat, where he eventually assumed the role of Speaker.

During his tenure in the California Assembly, McCarthy instituted a number of reforms. He reduced the number of oversight committees, provided members with bill analysis for floor sessions and provided more accountability and greater public access.

Leo McCarthy was a man on a mission, and in 1982, he ascended to what would become the pinnacle of his political career, the role of Lieutenant Governor of the State of California. As Lieutenant Governor, McCarthy wanted to unify the differing socioeconomic and cultural climates of the State. He established the Feminization of Poverty Task Force, which was comprised of women from all walks of life to develop ways to overcome economic barriers common amongst women and girls.

He also enacted legislation to better regulate nursing home patients and ensure that women had the best possible preventive care. He was an advocate for minority and female-owned businesses, and coerced business leaders into understanding the economic benefits of work site child care facilities.

When asked to reflect about his years in the public sector, Leo McCarthy said, "I was lucky. I was in a position to make a contribution. I felt very fortunate to have played a role. Some days were miserable, and some unhappy, but there were a lot of days that were great. There was a sense of satisfaction and being helpful to people."

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Leo McCarthy was a dedicated public servant and long time political force in the San Francisco area for decades. It is with sad news that we speak about him on the floor

today after learning about his recent death.

Throughout his political career, he worked tirelessly on issues such as coastal protection, nursing home reform, breast cancer awareness, female-owned small businesses, financing for the Bay Area Rapid Transit System, employer provided child care and the prevention of hate crimes, just to name a few.

He was born in Auckland, New Zealand and emigrated with his family to California at the age of 4. The son of an Irish bar owner, he was raised in San Francisco's Mission district and attended St. Ignatius College Preparatory.

Before his political life began, he served his country proudly in the Korean war in the U.S. Air Force. He earned his undergraduate degree from the University of San Francisco and his law degree from San Francisco law school.

He began his political career as the youngest member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 1963 before serving on the California Assembly from 1969 to 1982. He honorably led the California Assembly as its Speaker from 1974 to 1980. He was elected to a record three terms as Lieutenant Governor before retiring from politics in 1994. While serving as Lieutenant Governor, he instituted reforms to provide more accountability and greater public access. Among his work, he established the Feminization of Poverty Task Force comprised of women leaders from business executives to former welfare recipients to develop ways to overcome economic barriers confronting women. He also supported the Greater Avenues for Independence Program to help welfare recipients enter the work force.

After retiring from politics in 1994, his passion and dedication to public service continued with the creation of the Leo T. McCarthy Center for Public Service and the Common Good at the University of San Francisco. The goal of the center is to inspire and equip students for lives and careers of ethical public service and serving others. Since its inception in the fall of 2001, the McCarthy Center has initiated several programs including academic courses, public panels, internship programs and faculty-led projects that engage students in the analysis of social and political issues. Leo McCarthy's leadership in the center spread inspiration throughout all the students and staff involved. It exemplified his dedication to his community and to the greater good. He will be greatly missed by all those who knew him and worked with him.

I ask all Members to join me in support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the author of the bill, Representative ANNA ESHOO from California, be given 5½ minutes to speak.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague and my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle for being here today to pay tribute to really a great and very good man, Leo McCarthy.

I had the pleasure of knowing Leo for many, many, many years. He was not only my mentor; he was my friend. He was dear to my family. But he inspired me in public service. I had the privilege of serving as his chief of staff of his district office, which was in San Francisco, at the time, and I learned so much from him.

There are so many times, my colleagues, that the closer we get in terms of view of someone, the less we may like what we see. With Leo McCarthy, the closer I got, the more I saw, the more my respect for him was deepened.

□ 1545

He was a man of the fullest integrity. He was an honest man. An honest man. And he made everyone proud of his service to people not only in his beloved city of San Francisco but in the entire State of California. I think he helped to make California more golden of a State.

He was a policy wonk. He knew exactly why he had gone into government service. In all of his years serving on the board of supervisors in the city and county of San Francisco to his election to the assembly, the California Assembly, to his elevation as Speaker of the California Assembly, and then the time that he served as Lieutenant Governor, political writers, the people that he served, the counties throughout our State, 58 counties and the people that live in them, knew that Leo McCarthy's word was golden, that he was there to serve them and that that is what motivated him.

He was a great family man. All the years that he served in Sacramento, he drove home every single evening to be with his family in San Francisco. It was really the measure of the man. The love of his life was Jackie McCarthy, and he always said that she did the hard work because she was at home raising four extraordinary children: Sharon, Conna, Niall, and Adam. I wish all of my colleagues could have heard these four adults pay tribute to their father at St. Ignatius Church at the magnificent funeral mass that was in celebration of his good life.

He was a man filled with faith, and he served at a very early time in the minor seminary. And he said to me one day, Anna, that didn't last too long. And I responded to him, Leo, it lasted a lifetime. Because he blended his faith with the service that he gave to people and he was rooted in it.

When he left public life, he went on, and in the latter years of his all too short life, I think, I always wanted Leo to live forever, he founded a center at the University of San Francisco, his alma mater that he loved so much. And during the funeral mass, the Jesuits paid tribute to him. There must have

been 30 Jesuits on the alter, the archbishop of San Francisco, the former bishop of Oakland, and the auxiliary bishop, John Westor, all there to pay tribute to Leo McCarthy. That Center for Public Service and the Common Good spoke of Leo's desire to help students get involved in public policy at the State, at the Federal, and the local levels.

Leo McCarthy had a singular friend that loved him in unquestioned ways. He was his aid when Leo first went to Sacramento as a member of the State legislature. He then was elected in his own right to the State legislature. He then went on to become the mayor of San Francisco. And that man is Art Agnos. Every single day of Leo's too long illness, which marked all of last year, and at all other times in his life but especially during that difficult time, Art Agnos was by Leo's bedside every day, every night.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by thanking all the members of the committee for passing the resolution. It will mean a great deal to the family. I thank Josh Andrews in my office. I thank all of my colleagues. I know this will mean a great deal to the family.

And I say to whomever is listening in, God rest Leo McCarthy's noble soul.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague from the State of California (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank very much my colleague for yielding me this time.

I am very, very appreciative of this resolution being on the floor today. A phrase oft used in the West would suggest that you should "bring us men to match our mountains." And in California such men have made truly a magnificent difference in the way the far West was developed. Leo McCarthy certainly was at the top rank of those leaders.

I first met Leo McCarthy when he and I were elected to the State legislature together. We were classmates and colleagues and friends. A supervisor and assemblyman, became Speaker of the House, Lieutenant Governor of our State, a magnificent leader who absolutely wallowed in the business of public policy. He cared about making a difference on a number of issues across the spectrum of those issues that impact people's lives. He was a guy who was devoted to his family, as has been suggested, but also devoted to public service.

As we pay tribute to Leo McCarthy today, let us seek other men and women who would so serve, for, indeed, he is an example of the very best among us and reflects the best of our public affairs.

Let me say that probably most important to me over the years was the fact that Leo, while he played a very significant partisan role, absolutely knew in his soul that real solutions did not come by way of partisan confrontation. A magnificent leader who I am proud to say was my very good friend.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I request that Representative JIM COSTA of California speak for 2 minutes.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chair, ranking members, and colleagues, especially those who, like myself, from California had an opportunity to serve with Leo McCarthy.

Leo McCarthy, as has been said, put faith, family, and service as the preeminence in his life goals, and he lived them every day by example.

Leo McCarthy was Speaker when I was first elected to the State Assembly in 1978. Those were heady days in California, and Speaker McCarthy had a contentious caucus that he had to work with among younger members who thought that they oftentimes knew better. But I can tell you that from the lessons I learned firsthand from Speaker McCarthy, later to be our Lieutenant Governor, was that of being a quintessential legislator. He believed in process, he believed in transparency, he believed in accountability, and he believed in working in bipartisan fashions to solve problems for people of California. And because of those facts, Leo McCarthy's speakership was successful.

I was part of a group that ended up in what often happens within political families, a difficult speakership fight, and I chose for various reasons not to support Speaker McCarthy. Nonetheless, we traveled for over a year. During that entire time, Leo maintained class and maintained dignity and attempted to still reach out and bring the caucus back together.

That was not to be, but his legacy was the fact that he always, always treated people the way he wanted to be treated himself. And for that I would like to join with my colleagues in the memory of a tremendous public servant, not only in California but throughout our country, Leo T. McCarthy.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague from the State of California (Mr. DREIER).

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

And I want to thank my very distinguished colleague ANNA ESHOO for authoring this, and I want to congratulate my California colleagues on both sides of the aisle for once again coming together to recognize public service.

Mr. Speaker, I never had the opportunity to serve in Sacramento, but I did know Leo McCarthy to be an extraordinary public servant. And one of the things that is very moving, as I listened to the remarks of my colleague from Highland, Mr. LEWIS, who was elected with Governor McCarthy in 1968 to the California State legislature and as I listened to ANNA ESHOO, who I had no idea she was his district office representative, I was reminded of the fact that public service is a very important calling. And as I listened to Ms.

Foxx outline the service record, although I suspect she never met Leo McCarthy, she went through his extraordinary accomplishments.

As a legislator, I am reminded of the fact that we need to recognize that we are here to do the people's business. Yes, we need to have that clash of ideas. Yes, it is important that we engage in vigorous debate. But at the end of the day, we are here to accomplish very important things for the people whom we are honored to represent.

It was in 1963, as has been pointed out, that he first ran for the County Board of Supervisors, and I will say I learned not only that ANNA ESHOO was his district representative, I had heard that he was from New Zealand originally, but then when I heard he was from Auckland, I was of course reminded of the old story about the guy who got on an airplane to go to Oakland, California, and ended up in Auckland, New Zealand. And it sounded like Leo McCarthy actually took the reverse route, and I wondered how many times he was headed to Oakland that people might have thought that he was going home to Auckland.

But the fact is I had great regard for Leo McCarthy, and I wondered why anyone would leave New Zealand, because it is a spectacular spot. In fact, I have said on more than a few occasions if I didn't have the opportunity to live in the United States of America, New Zealand would be the spot that I would live in.

But having said that, I will simply say that my colleagues, Republican and Democrat alike, had great regard for Leo McCarthy and his extraordinary public service to the people of California.

May God rest his soul, and our thoughts and prayers are with his wonderful family members. And I know that one of the things Leo McCarthy said when asked the question what his greatest accomplishments would be, he said it was his family, and so our thoughts and prayers are with them.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I request 2½ minutes for Representative HOWARD L. BERMAN from California.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague Ms. WATSON for yielding me this time.

I came to Sacramento as a State assemblyman, elected in 1972, began my service in 1973, and had never known Leo McCarthy or met him before that time. Already in the California Assembly, a speakership fight was brewing between Leo McCarthy and sort of the favored candidate over the vacancy which would occur when the Speaker at that time was planning to run for Governor and would be giving up his seat. In the course of the year and a half between the time I came to Sacramento and the time that I voted for Speaker, I got to know someone who was particularly unique in terms of public office and public service.

I would say three words characterize the service of Leo McCarthy in all as-

pects of his public career and, I think, of his personal life: probity, energy, and a tremendous level of integrity.

This was a very unusual public servant. He cared deeply about the public interest, about policy, about learning what needed to be known to be effective and advocating for policies, about building legislative consensus, and about making things happen.

During the 5 years that he was Speaker in the State Assembly, I had the honor of being for 4½ of those 5½ years his majority floor leader. The end of our legislative careers wasn't quite as good as the start of it because we ended up in a speakership fight that got rather out of control and 11 months of battle. I think of speakership fights in California as war by other means, and that is what we had during that time. And, unfortunately, after that time while our relationship was civil and friendly, it was never as close as it was before.

□ 1600

I have never met anybody who made his fundamental decisions on what legislation to prioritize, what to push based on a focus on the public interest without regard to what a particular lobbyist or a particular specialist might push, with a level of integrity and with a level of energy, it has already been referenced in terms of his career, that was really unique in public office. He really was a very fine man, a very youthful man. In fact, his passing is so tragic because of that youth and vigor that he always exhibited.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the passage of H. Res. 180, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATSON. I request that the Speaker take as much time as she desires, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. To both of them, thank you for bringing this resolution honoring Leo McCarthy to the floor. He was a very special person to us, and I thank you. Congresswoman ESHOO, thank you for your leadership in bringing this as well.

I am pleased to join my California colleagues, and others, in singing the praises of one great man, Leo McCarthy.

Mr. Speaker, in the Book of Ecclesiastes, there is a chapter known as the Eulogy of Heroes; its words could be used to describe Leo McCarthy.

"Now let us praise great men, the heroes of our nation's history, through whom the Lord has established His renown and revealed His majesty. Some were sage counselors who led the people by their counsel and by their knowledge of the law; out of their fund of wisdom, they gave instruction. They were men of loyalty, whose good deeds have not been forgotten."

I know that all who knew Leo McCarthy knows how fitting that description is of him. Leo McCarthy was indeed such a person. And as the Eulogy of He-

roes proclaims, "He will be buried in peace, but his name lives forever, as people recount his wisdom."

Leo's great wisdom was in knowing that the future of his children, Sharon, Conna, Adam and Niall, was linked to the destiny of all children. There were many years when, as the most senior Democrat in California politics, Lieutenant Governor Leo McCarthy was the main person standing between drastic cuts to benefits for our children, the elderly and the disabled.

Leo took seriously the responsibility to carry the banner of the Democratic Party, as he advanced social and economic justice. As Speaker of the State Assembly House and Lieutenant Governor, Leo promoted a values-based agenda to educate our children, grow our economy and protect our environment. He did so living up to the highest ethical standards, and he always strove to act in a bipartisan way.

Leo's word was his bond. And when he promised that he would protect our seniors and stand up for California's magnificent coastline, he kept his word. In fact, Leo was so scrupulously principled and honest that there are those of us who thought he must be wearing a Boy Scout uniform under his business suit. What was under there was a heart of gold. And really, in all of the testimonials that followed Leo's passing, I said he had the heart of a lion; they said he was a lion.

Leo opened public service to so many Californians, opening up the Democratic Party and welcoming in the grassroots. As a former staffer of his said, Leo liked to take chances on talent. From him they got not only their start but also their ethics, how to look after their family, their community and their country at the same time.

He also encouraged the next generation of leadership through his work at the University of San Francisco as head of the Leo T. McCarthy Center for Public Service and the Common Good. Leo helped to give me my start, encouraging me not only to support candidates but to run in my own right. I consider him both a dear friend and a purposeful mentor.

He made my first run for Congress a family affair, with my children working alongside his children to elect me to Congress. I said, again, he had a heart of gold, he also had the heart of a lion which sustained him through his illness. With all the strength that he could muster and a clear mind, he gave me sage counsel and wise instruction, as the eulogy said, through this last campaign, always reminding me that it was necessary to win in order to keep faith with the American people. And I know he took special joy in our victories in November, indeed, they were his victories as well.

Leo was optimistic to the end. And as recently as Saturday night, which was the Saturday night before he passed, I spoke to him and he said, My morale is high. I am home with Jackie, that is his wife, and my children and my

grandchildren are with me. More than anything, Leo loved his family, his wife Jackie, his children and grandchildren.

My husband Paul and I and my entire family extend our deep sympathy to Jackie, Sharon, Conna, Adam and Niall. Again, I hope it is a comfort to them that so many people mourn their loss, sing Leo's praises and are praying for them at this sad time.

Mr. Speaker, Leo McCarthy will be buried in peace, but his name lives forever as people recount his wisdom.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I request 2 minutes for the gentleman from California, SAM FARR.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the Members that served with Leo McCarthy. I was a member of the California legislature. And like Speaker PELOSI, he was the one who convinced me, when I was a young staff member working for the California legislature in 1975, that I ought to return to my district and start running in public life for politics. And that is what got me into being a county supervisor, and the rest is history.

But serving with Leo McCarthy indeed is distinction for all the reasons talked about. But I loved his youthful energy. The shock of Leo McCarthy dying is that he never looked old, never seemed old. He always had the energy of youth; looked young; and just was a remarkable person. He twice ran for the United States Senate. And doing that in California is indeed a tough problem because the State is so big, so expansive, and it requires so much time, and Leo would never abandon his family.

I remember, Leo was born in Auckland, New Zealand, and I remember going on a trip to Auckland, New Zealand with him. He was welcomed home as a town hero. He pointed out that because he was born in that town, he could never run for President of the United States, not being a native born. I also traveled with him to Canada, when we went on several of the communications issues. And I remember him so devoted to Jackie that he took all his life savings to make sure that Jackie could have a wonderful coat that she wanted, and I know that she still has that.

Ladies and gentlemen, Leo McCarthy was the kind of person you want in public life. And indeed, California is better off for having him serve. It is a great State, and he made it greater. He produced a lot of us that are serving in Congress. And certainly, almost like a daughter, ANNA ESHOO, the author of this resolution, and NANCY PELOSI, Speaker of the House, he has a lot to be proud of. We are very proud that we were able to work for him, serve for him and be in public life with him.

All our condolences go to Jackie and the family.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to extend the time of debate 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I request 2 minutes for the gentleman from California, BRAD SHERMAN.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congresswoman ESHOO for offering this important legislation that I am proud to have cosponsored, honoring the life and achievements of Leo McCarthy and expressing the sorrow of the House of Representatives on his death.

The resolution properly recounts and reflects Leo's many accomplishments, a lifetime dedicated to effective service on behalf of the people of California and of the United States. Yet Leo McCarthy's life was much more than the titles he earned and the awards he accumulated. He was a loving husband to Jacqueline, his wife of 51 years, and a father of four children and 11 grandchildren. When Leo McCarthy died on February 5, he also left a world of friends.

It is fitting that my colleagues have obtained the opportunity to speak of Leo's many outstanding personal accomplishments and his qualities, his loyalty, his friendliness, his wise counsel. Those of us who knew Leo knew these qualities well.

As Speaker of the California Assembly for 6 years, and then during his unprecedented three terms as Lieutenant Governor, Leo was responsible for path-breaking legislation such as the California Coastal Act and the Nursing Home Patients Protection Act. He led the way toward implementation of important initiatives to educate business on the value of employer-provided health care and programs to help welfare recipients move into the workplace.

Leo was a charitable man who encouraged public service through his contributions and his service at the University of San Francisco and as head of the Leo T. McCarthy Center for Public Service and the Common Good.

I join in expressing the profound sorrow of this House and in offering my personal condolences to the McCarthy family on Leo's death. Our prayers are with all of you who mourn Leo McCarthy.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Leo McCarthy, former Lieutenant Governor of California, who passed away last month after a long illness due to a kidney ailment.

Born in New Zealand, Leo began his lifetime of public service for his adopted country as a member the United States Air Force Strategic Air Command in the Korean War.

His political service began in 1963 when he was elected to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and later to the California Assembly, where he had the honor and distinction of serving as speaker from 1974 to 1980.

In 1982 he was elected Lieutenant Governor—a position he held until 1994.

Leo's dedication to his community was clear from the diversity of issues on which he worked: from assisting welfare recipients, to increasing breast cancer awareness, to finding ways to stop toxic contamination.

He also worked to promote tolerance by establishing the Lieutenant Governor's Commission on the Prevention of Hate Violence.

After leaving the political field, Leo continued to serve the community by founding the Leo T. McCarthy Center for Public Service and the Common Good at the University of San Francisco.

This Center, where young men and women can learn and be inspired to pursue a life and career of ethical public service, is a fitting legacy for a man whose life was devoted to serving the community.

Leo McCarthy is survived by his wife, Jacqueline, their four children and eleven grandchildren. Our thoughts and prayers are with them.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for H. Res. 180. This bipartisan resolution honors the life and achievements of Leo T. McCarthy, and expresses profound sorrow on his recent death.

I want to thank my friend and colleague from California, Representative ESHOO, for sponsoring this resolution.

Leo McCarthy was many things in his life. He was an airman, a politician, and a life-long public servant. But above all things, he was a decent and compassionate man.

Leo was first elected to the California Assembly in 1968.

He served with honor and distinction as its Speaker from 1974 and 1980 and went on to serve as Lieutenant Governor of California for three terms.

Leo's accomplishments in office express the compassion and love he possessed for his fellow man.

His leadership helped change the way California looked at issues like child care, breast cancer research, elder care, and treatment for the mentally ill.

Beyond his professional work, he was a loving family man, and dedicated friend and mentor to countless of my California peers.

I urge my colleagues to honor the life of this good man. May he rest in peace.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 180.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 98, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 149, by the yeas and nays.

The vote on H.R. 710 will be taken tomorrow.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

HONORING THE LIFE AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE LATE DR. JOHN GARANG DE MABIOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 98, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 98, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 1, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 121]

YEAS—410

Ackerman	Clyburn	Gohmert
Aderholt	Coble	Gonzalez
Akin	Cohen	Goode
Alexander	Cole (OK)	Goodlatte
Allen	Conaway	Gordon
Altmire	Conyers	Granger
Andrews	Cooper	Graves
Arcuri	Costa	Green, Al
Baca	Costello	Green, Gene
Bachmann	Courtney	Grijalva
Bachus	Cramer	Gutierrez
Baird	Crenshaw	Hall (NY)
Baker	Crowley	Hall (TX)
Baldwin	Cuellar	Hare
Barrett (SC)	Culberson	Harman
Barrow	Cummings	Hastert
Bartlett (MD)	Davis (AL)	Hastings (FL)
Barton (TX)	Davis (CA)	Hastings (WA)
Bean	Davis (KY)	Hayes
Becerra	Davis, David	Heller
Berkley	Davis, Lincoln	Hensarling
Berman	Davis, Tom	Herger
Berry	Deal (GA)	Herseth
Biggert	DeFazio	Higgins
Bilbray	DeGette	Hill
Bilirakis	Delahunt	Hinche
Bishop (GA)	Dent	Hinojosa
Bishop (NY)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hirono
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hobson
Blackburn	Dicks	Hodes
Blumenauer	Dingell	Hoekstra
Blunt	Doggett	Holden
Boehner	Donnelly	Holt
Bonner	Doolittle	Honda
Boozman	Doyle	Hooley
Boren	Drake	Hoyer
Boswell	Dreier	Hulshof
Boucher	Duncan	Hunter
Boustany	Edwards	Inglis (SC)
Boyd (FL)	Ehlers	Inslee
Boyd (KS)	Ellison	Israel
Brady (PA)	Ellsworth	Issa
Brady (TX)	Emanuel	Jackson (IL)
Braley (IA)	Emerson	Jefferson
Brown (SC)	Engel	Johnson (GA)
Brown-Waite,	English (PA)	Johnson (IL)
Ginny	Eshoo	Johnson, Sam
Buchanan	Etheridge	Jones (NC)
Burgess	Everett	Jordan
Burton (IN)	Fallin	Kagen
Buyer	Farr	Kanjorski
Calvert	Fattah	Kaptur
Camp (MI)	Feeney	Keller
Campbell (CA)	Ferguson	Kennedy
Cannon	Filner	Kildee
Cantor	Flake	Kind
Capito	Forbes	King (IA)
Capps	Fortenberry	King (NY)
Capuano	Fossella	Kingston
Cardoza	Fox	Kirk
Carnahan	Frank (MA)	Klein (FL)
Carney	Franks (AZ)	Kline (MN)
Carson	Frelinghuysen	Knollenberg
Carter	Gallely	Kucinich
Castle	Garrett (NJ)	Kuhl (NY)
Castor	Gerlach	LaHood
Chabot	Giffords	Lamborn
Chandler	Gilchrest	Lampson
Clarke	Gillibrand	Langevin
Clay	Gillmor	Lantos
Cleaver	Gingrey	Larsen (WA)

Latham	Nunes	Shea-Porter
LaTourette	Oberstar	Sherman
Lee	Obey	Shimkus
Levin	Oliver	Shuler
Lewis (CA)	Ortiz	Shuster
Lewis (GA)	Pallone	Simpson
Lewis (KY)	Pascarell	Sires
Linder	Pastor	Skelton
Lipinski	Payne	Slaughter
LoBiondo	Pearce	Smith (NE)
Loeb sack	Pence	Smith (NJ)
Lofgren, Zoe	Perlmutter	Smith (TX)
Lowey	Peterson (MN)	Smith (WA)
Lucas	Peterson (PA)	Snyder
Lungren, Daniel	Petri	Solis
E.	Pickering	Souder
Lynch	Pitts	Space
Mack	Platts	Spratt
Mahoney (FL)	Poe	Stark
Maloney (NY)	Pomeroy	Stearns
Manzullo	Porter	Stupak
Marchant	Price (GA)	Sullivan
Markey	Price (NC)	Sutton
Marshall	Pryce (OH)	Tancredo
Matheson	Putnam	Tanner
Matsui	Radanovich	Taylor
McCarthy (CA)	Rahall	Terry
McCarthy (NY)	Ramstad	Thompson (CA)
McCaul (TX)	Rangel	Thompson (MS)
McCollum (MN)	Regula	Thornberry
McCotter	Rehberg	Tiberi
McCrery	Reichert	Tierney
McDermott	Renzi	Towns
McHenry	Reyes	Turner
McHugh	Reynolds	Udall (CO)
McIntyre	Rodriguez	Upton
McKeon	Rogers (AL)	Van Hollen
McMorris	Rogers (KY)	Velazquez
Rodgers	Rogers (MI)	Visclosky
McNerney	Rohrabacher	Walberg
McNulty	Ros-Lehtinen	Walden (OR)
Meehan	Roskam	Walsh (NY)
Melancon	Ross	Walz (MN)
Mica	Rothman	Wamp
Michaud	Roybal-Allard	Waters
Millender-	Royce	Watson
McDonald	Ruppersberger	Watt
Miller (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Waxman
Miller (MI)	Ryan (WI)	Weiner
Miller (NC)	Salazar	Welch (VT)
Miller, Gary	Sali	Weldon (FL)
Miller, George	Sanchez, Linda	Weller
Mitchell	T.	Westmoreland
Mollohan	Sanchez, Loretta	Wexler
Moore (KS)	Sarbanes	Whitfield
Moore (WI)	Saxton	Wicker
Moran (KS)	Schakowsky	Wilson (NM)
Moran (VA)	Schiff	Wilson (OH)
Murphy (CT)	Schmidt	Wilson (SC)
Murphy, Patrick	Schwartz	Wolf
Murphy, Tim	Scott (GA)	Woolsey
Murtha	Scott (VA)	Wu
Musgrave	Sensenbrenner	Wynn
Myrick	Serrano	Yarmuth
Nadler	Sessions	Young (AK)
Napolitano	Sestak	Young (FL)
Neal (MA)	Shadegg	
Neugebauer	Shays	

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—22

Abercrombie	Jackson-Lee	Meek (FL)
Bono	(TX)	Meeks (NY)
Brown, Corrine	Jindal	Rush
Butterfield	Johnson, E. B.	Tauscher
Cubin	Jones (OH)	Tiahrt
Davis (IL)	Kilpatrick	Udall (NM)
Davis, Jo Ann	Larson (CT)	Wasserman
DeLauro	McGovern	Schultz

□ 1641

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Stated against:

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF FORMER U.S. SENATOR THOMAS F. EAGLETON

(Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to advise and remind the Members of the passing of former U.S. Senator Thomas F. Eagleton of Missouri over this past weekend, and I ask the House to observe a moment of silence in his memory.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All Members will rise.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS OF INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 149.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 149, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 403, nays 0, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 122]

YEAS—403

Ackerman	Boustany	Cooper
Aderholt	Boyd (FL)	Costa
Akin	Boyda (KS)	Costello
Alexander	Brady (TX)	Courtney
Allen	Braley (IA)	Cramer
Altmire	Brown (SC)	Crenshaw
Andrews	Brown-Waite,	Crowley
Arcuri	Ginny	Cuellar
Baca	Buchanan	Culberson
Bachmann	Burgess	Cummings
Bachus	Burton (IN)	Davis (AL)
Baird	Buyer	Davis (CA)
Baker	Calvert	Davis (KY)
Baldwin	Camp (MI)	Davis, David
Barrett (SC)	Campbell (CA)	Davis, Lincoln
Barrow	Cannon	Davis, Tom
Bartlett (MD)	Cantor	Deal (GA)
Barton (TX)	Capito	DeFazio
Bean	Capps	DeGette
Becerra	Capuano	Delahunt
Berkley	Cardoza	Dent
Berman	Carnahan	Diaz-Balart, L.
Berry	Carney	Diaz-Balart, M.
Biggert	Carson	Dicks
Bilbray	Carter	Dingell
Bilirakis	Castle	Doggett
Bishop (GA)	Castor	Donnelly
Bishop (NY)	Chabot	Doolittle
Bishop (UT)	Chandler	Doyle
Blackburn	Clarke	Drake
Blumenauer	Clay	Dreier
Blunt	Cleaver	Duncan
Boehner	Clyburn	Edwards
Bonner	Coble	Ehlers
Boozman	Cohen	Ellison
Boren	Cole (OK)	Ellsworth
Boswell	Conaway	Emanuel
Boucher	Conyers	Emerson

Engel	Lee	Reyes
English (PA)	Levin	Reynolds
Eshoo	Levin (CA)	Rodriguez
Etheridge	Lewis (GA)	Rogers (AL)
Everett	Lewis (KY)	Rogers (KY)
Fallin	Linder	Rogers (MI)
Farr	Lipinski	Rohrabacher
Feeney	LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen
Ferguson	Loebach	Roskam
Filner	Lofgren, Zoe	Ross
Flake	Lowe	Rothman
Forbes	Lucas	Roybal-Allard
Fortenberry	Lungren, Daniel	Royce
Fossella	E.	Ruppersberger
Fox	Lynch	Ryan (OH)
Frank (MA)	Mack	Ryan (WI)
Franks (AZ)	Mahoney (FL)	Salazar
Frelinghuysen	Maloney (NY)	Sánchez, Linda
Gallely	Manzullo	T.
Garrett (NJ)	Marchant	Sanchez, Loretta
Gerlach	Marshall	Sarbanes
Giffords	Matheson	Schakowsky
Gilchrest	Matsui	Schiff
Gillibrand	McCarthy (CA)	Schmidt
Gillmor	McCarthy (NY)	Schwartz
Gingrey	McCaul (TX)	Scott (GA)
Gohmert	McCollum (MN)	Scott (VA)
Gonzalez	McCotter	Sensenbrenner
Goode	McCrery	Serrano
Goodlatte	McDermott	Sessions
Granger	McGovern	Sestak
Graves	McHenry	Shadegg
Green, Al	McHugh	Shays
Green, Gene	McIntyre	Shea-Porter
Grijalva	McKeon	Sherman
Gutierrez	McMorris	Shimkus
Hall (NY)	Rodgers	Shuler
Hall (TX)	McNerney	Shuster
Hare	McNulty	Simpson
Harman	Meehan	Sires
Hastert	Melancon	Skelton
Hastings (FL)	Mica	Slaughter
Hastings (WA)	Michaud	Smith (NE)
Hayes	Millender-	Smith (NJ)
Heller	McDonald	Smith (TX)
Hensarling	Miller (FL)	Smith (WA)
Herger	Miller (MI)	Snyder
Hersteth	Miller (NC)	Solis
Higgins	Miller, Gary	Souder
Hill	Miller, George	Spratt
Hinchey	Mitchell	Stark
Hinojosa	Mollohan	Stearns
Hirono	Moore (KS)	Stupak
Hobson	Moore (WI)	Sullivan
Hodes	Moran (KS)	Sutton
Hoekstra	Moran (VA)	Tancred
Holden	Murphy (CT)	Tanner
Holt	Murphy, Patrick	Taylor
Honda	Murphy, Tim	Terry
Hooley	Murtha	Thompson (CA)
Hoyer	Musgrave	Thompson (MS)
Hulshof	Myrick	Thornberry
Hunter	Nadler	Tiberi
Inglis (SC)	Napolitano	Tierney
Inslee	Neal (MA)	Towns
Israel	Neugebauer	Turner
Issa	Nunes	Udall (CO)
Jackson (IL)	Oberstar	Upton
Jefferson	Obey	Van Hollen
Johnson (GA)	Olver	Velázquez
Johnson (IL)	Ortiz	Visclosky
Johnson, Sam	Pallone	Walberg
Jones (NC)	Pascrell	Walden (OR)
Jordan	Pastor	Walsh (NY)
Kagen	Paul	Walz (MN)
Kanjorski	Payne	Wamp
Kaptur	Pearce	Waters
Keller	Pence	Watson
Kennedy	Perlmutter	Watt
Kildee	Peterson (MN)	Waxman
Kind	Peterson (PA)	Weiner
King (IA)	Petri	Welch (VT)
King (NY)	Pickering	Weldon (FL)
Kingston	Pitts	Weller
Kirk	Platts	Westmoreland
Klein (FL)	Poe	Wexler
Kline (MN)	Pomeroy	Whitfield
Knollenberg	Porter	Wicker
Kucinich	Pryce (NC)	Wilson (NM)
Kuhl (NY)	Pryce (OH)	Wilson (OH)
LaHood	Putnam	Wilson (SC)
Lamborn	Rahall	Wolf
Lampson	Ramstad	Woolsey
Langevin	Rangel	Wu
Lantos	Regula	Wynn
Larsen (WA)	Rehberg	Yarmuth
Latham	Reichert	Young (AK)
LaTourette	Renzi	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—30

Abercrombie	Jackson-Lee	Radanovich
Bono	(TX)	Rush
Brady (PA)	Jindal	Sali
Brown, Corrine	Johnson, E. B.	Saxton
Butterfield	Jones (OH)	Space
Cubin	Kilpatrick	Tauscher
Davis (IL)	Larson (CT)	Tiahrt
Davis, Jo Ann	Markey	Udall (NM)
DeLauro	Meek (FL)	Wasserman
Fattah	Meeks (NY)	Schultz
Gordon	Price (GA)	

□ 1652

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I could not be present today, Tuesday, March 6, 2007 to vote on rollcall vote Nos. 121 and 122 due to a family medical matter.

Had I been present, I would have voted:

"Yea" on rollcall vote No. 121 on passage of H. Res. 98, a bill honoring the life and achievements of the late Dr. John Garang de Mabior and reaffirming the continued commitment of the House of Representatives to a just and lasting peace in the Republic of the Sudan. "Yea" on rollcall vote No. 122 on passage of H. Res. 149, a bill supporting the goals of International Women's Day

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I regret that due to official business, I was unable to vote on Tuesday, March 6, 2007. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote 121, Final passage of H. Res. 98 as amended, Honoring the Life and Achievements of the late Dr. John Garang de Mabior and Reaffirming the Continued Commitment of the House of Representatives to a Just and Lasting Peace in the Republic of the Sudan, and "yea" on rollcall vote 122, Final Passage of H. Res. 149, Supporting the Goals of International Women's Day.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 569, WATER QUALITY INVESTMENT ACT OF 2007

Ms. SLAUGHTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-31) on the resolution (H. Res. 214) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 569) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for sewer overflow control grants, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 700, HEALTHY COMMUNITIES WATER SUPPLY ACT OF 2007

Ms. SLAUGHTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privi-

leged report (Rept. No. 110-32) on the resolution (H. Res. 215) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 700) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to extend the pilot program for alternative water source projects, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 866

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 866.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PROTECTING BORDER VIOLATORS

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, being a lawman in the vastness of west Texas has always been a rough task. Now it is more difficult because the Federal Government has taken the side of the lawbreaker over the lawman.

Deputy Gilmer Hernandez of Edwards County, Texas, was recently on patrol in the darkness of the night in Rocksprings, Texas, when he spotted a van violating Texas traffic laws. He pulls the van over and notices numerous people lying down on the floor.

Then without warning, the driver suddenly drives off and tries to run over Deputy Hernandez. Hernandez shoots out the tires of the van in self-defense. The other illegals jump out and take off.

The Texas Rangers do a thorough investigation and clear Deputy Hernandez of any wrongdoing, but the Mexican Government arrogantly demands the Federal Government prosecute Hernandez for using his gun, and the Feds do exactly that.

Hernandez is convicted, and now he is in jail awaiting sentencing by a Federal judge, all because he did his job. Our government ought to support the border protectors like Hernandez and prosecute the border violators. Why is our Federal Government taking the wrong side in the border war?

And that's just the way it is.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

NO PLAN B IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker and my esteemed colleagues, one of the most grievous blunders in the whole Iraq debacle was the total failure to figure out what we would do after toppling Saddam Hussein. The architects of this war thought that was the whole task. Mission accomplished.

There was no plan for how to manage the aftermath. No plan for keeping the peace in a country with deep sectarian divisions, no plan for how to institute democracy in a society with no democratic infrastructure or institutions. Well, now we see history repeating itself, because The Washington Post reported yesterday that the Bush administration and top military commanders apparently have no idea what the next step is if the troop escalation plan fails, which General Petraeus himself believes probably will.

The Post reports that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Peter Pace, told a meeting of the Nation's Governors: "I'm a Marine, and Marines don't talk about failure. They talk about victory."

Well, confidence is one thing. Single mindedness is another, and, frankly, if the Bush national security team had a better track record of smart decisions and strategic successes, I might be willing to give them the benefit of the doubt. But as it turns out, these folks have been wrong, very wrong, throughout most of this occupation.

Indeed, when President Bush announced the so-called surge nearly 2 months ago, he essentially conceded that mistakes had been made and not everything his administration has done in Iraq has gone by design.

But as yesterday's Post article points out, we are way beyond plan B. This is more like plan D. There have been many times that we have been told the necessary adjustments are being made to achieve victory, whatever that means, in the context of Iraq.

But here we are, 4 years into this war, still spinning our wheels and nearly 3,200 Americans dead, and the ones who come home in one piece sent to military hospitals that are in deplorable conditions, often delivering substandard care. How many more chances does the Bush administration get to make things right in Iraq? I say: none. There is only one solution: bring our troops home in short order as soon as logistically and safely as possible.

□ 1700

In a way, actually, all the discussion about whether plan A, B, C, D, is, at best, something of a distraction is like arguing about what was the worst part of a root canal. The fact is, the whole Iraq enterprise was fundamentally flawed from the beginning and never should have been launched in the first place. There is not much we can do now

to reverse the unforgivable mistake of this Iraq occupation and the unspeakable damages done, but we can do something to ensure it doesn't last a minute longer. We can here in the United States Congress use our Constitutional powers to ensure that not one more family has to lose a son or daughter, a husband or wife, a mother or father for someone else's ideological mess.

It is time, Mr. Speaker. It is time for this tragic chapter in American history to finally end. It is time to bring our troops home.

U.S. BORDER PATROL AGENTS
RAMOS AND COMPEAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today is the 49th day since two U.S. Border Patrol Agents entered Federal prison. Agents Ramos and Compean were convicted last spring for shooting a Mexican drug smuggler who brought 743 pounds of marijuana across our borders into Texas.

These agents never should have been sent to prison. There are legitimate legal questions about how this prosecution was initiated and how the prosecutor's office proceeded in this case.

To prosecute the agents, the U.S. Attorney's Office granted immunity to the known drug smuggler. Homeland Security officials promised Members of Congress information about this case, then they could not provide the information. Recently, reports indicated that the prosecutors in this case may have withheld crucial evidence from the defense. Mr. Speaker, I am going to repeat that. Recently, reports indicated that the prosecutors in this case may have withheld crucial evidence from the defense.

Drug Enforcement Agency reports have revealed that the Mexican drug smuggler brought a second load of marijuana, 752 pounds, into the United States. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this drug smuggler is not an American citizen, and he is suing the Border Patrol for \$5 million. But, Mr. Speaker, the information I just mentioned, this information was kept from the jury and the public.

Mr. Speaker, I have sent a letter to House Judiciary Chairman JOHN CONYERS asking for hearings on this case and, Mr. Speaker, other Members have made the same request of the chairman. And knowing the chairman to be a fair-minded person, I hope that he will hold hearings on this prosecutor in west Texas and how he looked into this case and brought this case to the jury, because, again, these Border Agents are heroes. They are not convicts; they are heroes.

Over the past 6 months, dozens of Members of Congress have asked the President to pardon these agents. I myself have sent five letters to the Presi-

dent asking that he pardon these two agents. They are heroes of this country. They should not be in Federal prison.

Mr. President, we are calling on you to listen to the American people and to the thousands of citizens who have petitioned you to pardon these men. It is time for justice to prevail over an injustice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WAR IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, in a few short days the Congress of the United States will have an opportunity to end the war in Iraq if it so pleases, or we will vote to approve the supplemental and give the President of the United States the money that he is asking for to continue the war possibly through the end of his term.

In the next 5 minutes, I would like to discuss the implications of Congress's action and a plan that would enable us to take a new direction in Iraq, to bring our troops home, to stabilize Iraq, to close our bases, to end the occupation, and to end the war.

Last week, I submitted to this Congress such a plan embodied in H.R. 1234. H.R. 1234 is a plan to end the war, and it contains a number of elements which were arrived at with the help of people who have long experience at the U.N. in peacekeeping missions and security missions, experts in international relations, and military experts.

Two days ago, the administration said that it has no plan B for Iraq. As a matter of fact, a senior general said, "Plan B is plan A," which means that the administration is committed to a course of action which would keep our troops in Iraq through the end of its term. That is simply not acceptable.

In November, the American people voted for a new direction. In November, the American people changed the leadership of the Congress, voted to turn both the House and the Senate from Republican control to Democratic control, and I submit the issue was the war.

All across this country there is a great concern about the rising number of casualties; about that even when our troops serve and they come home after being injured, they are not being cared for; about the costs of the war, how we are seeing our budgets for housing and health care, for education, for seniors services, and, indeed, for veterans affairs reduced.

America is losing not only the lives of our soldiers, not only are we going into a great financial debt borrowing money from Beijing to fight a war in Baghdad, but we are losing our moral position in the world, continuing to prosecute a war that is simply based on lies. Let's face it, every assertion made that took us into Iraq has been ripped away as being a lie.

So what are we to do? H.R. 1234 does the following: It is predicated on Congress taking action to end the war, stop the funding. At that point, the administration will go to the world community and say, "Look, the money is no longer here for the war. We are going to close our bases, we are going to end the occupation, we are going to bring our troops home." Only by asserting that we will end the occupation will we be in a position to be able to get help from the world community, which really doesn't want anything to do with this war absent the United States taking a new direction.

The insurgency is fueled by the occupation. It is well understood. So we end the occupation. But then that is not enough. We need the international community to help us build a peacekeeping and security force that would move in as our troops move out.

The elements of the plan embodied in H.R. 1234 are the following: Not only do we end the occupation and bring our troops home and get the international community involved, but we also create the context for a program of reconciliation between the Shiites, the Sunnis, and the Kurds. Right now there is no movement towards reconciliation, because with the U.S. occupying, the Shiites don't have any incentive at all to do that. We need to move out so that we can set in place a program of reconciliation and a program of honest reconstruction. No more theft from the American taxpayers or the Iraqi people by these contractors whose performance has been absolutely abominable, who have stolen billions of dollars. Give the Iraqi people a chance to have their own reconstruction program, with the jobs going to the people of Iraq so they can feed their families. In an economy with 50 percent of the people unemployed, we need to take a new approach and end the reconstruction program as it exists and start a new one.

In future presentations to this Congress, I intend to lay out the rest of H.R. 1234, which is the plan to end the war, bring our troops home, stabilize Iraq, and take a new chapter in America's relationship with the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HULSHOF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE GLOBAL NATURE OF OUR ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, as we clearly saw last week with the sharp decline in our stock market following a major drop in the Chinese market, the increasingly global nature of our economy is one of the most defining issues of our time. The growing connectedness of the world's consumers, producers, workers, and investors is having an impact on virtually every aspect of our lives. And with all the rapid change that globalization is bringing about, it is very natural for us to ask ourselves the question: Have these changes been for the better? We want to know if globalization is improving our lives or making them worse.

Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest concerns that we have when we look at this question is the issue of income inequality, something that many people are talking about. We read reports of massive executive salaries, and compare them to the circumstances of America's middle class and the concerns that working families have, and we inevitably wonder if the system is in fact fair. I recently spoke here on this issue, on this very question.

The critical issue is not, Mr. Speaker, whether those at the top are becoming more prosperous; the critical issue is whether everyone is becoming more prosperous, particularly those who are at the bottom of the economic ladder.

We looked at the issue of wages and saw that they are growing for all workers. But when we looked even deeper, we saw that the outlook is even more positive. The purchasing power of working families is increased by lower taxes and greater access to low-cost goods through international trade. This growing purchasing power, along with rising wages, is increasing the standard of living for all Americans, with the greatest positive impact for those who are just beginning to move up the economic ladder.

Today, I want to look at another issue that helps to answer the question of whether quality of life is improving for everyone; that is, the issue of jobs, Mr. Speaker. More specifically, new job creation, and the quality of those new jobs.

Jobs are perhaps the most critical issue in determining standards of living. Does everyone who wants a job have a job? Does that job provide the opportunity to prosper and improve one's quality of life? Just as we saw with wages, the numbers demonstrate a very positive outlook for workers. Unemployment is at 4.6 percent, a rate that is exceptionally low. Mr. Speaker, in fact, we have had 16 straight months of unemployment at 5 percent or less. At the same time, the workforce has been rapidly expanding. Our economy has created nearly 7½ million new jobs in the last 3½ years. There are 146 mil-

lion Americans working today, more than at any time in our Nation's history. The jobs outlook in the United States continues to be very, very good.

But just like with wages, we see an even fuller picture, a better picture when we dig just a little deeper. Average monthly hires last year were nearly 5 million, the highest rate ever since data have been collected. Of those 5 million, the share of workers who left their old job voluntarily for new work was also at the highest level. 58.3 percent made that move. This means that workers are not just finding jobs, they are finding better jobs, better opportunities. Anyone who has been stuck in a dead-end job knows that this is a huge quality of life issue.

Having a job is essential to providing for a family, and any job can serve as a starting point to success. But having a good job that offers new opportunities to prosper is essential to a growing standard of living.

The fact that we are seeing 5 million new hires every month demonstrates a great deal of churn and dynamism in our workforce, and we know that that change is not always easy.

But the rapidly growing number of workers who are voluntarily leaving their old jobs demonstrates that new and better opportunities are being created. It demonstrates, Mr. Speaker, the increased confidence in our workforce that comes with growing prosperity and the prospect of a better life. And it also helps to answer the question of whether the standard of living is improving for everyone, not just those who are at the top of the economic ladder.

□ 1715

New jobs and new opportunities are helping to make all of us more prosperous.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to continue to pursue pro-growth economic policies, including an embrace of America's global leadership role. Those policies have brought about this dynamic workforce, where everyone is upwardly mobile.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

BALLAD OF THE ALAMO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE.

In the southern part of Texas
In the town of San Antonio
There's a fortress all in ruins
That the weeds have overgrown.

You may look in vain for crosses
 And you'll never see a one.
 But sometime between the setting
 And the rising of the sun
 You can hear a ghostly bugle
 As the men go marching by.
 You can hear them as they answer
 To that roll call in the sky.
 Colonel William Barrett Travis, Davy Crockett
 And 180 more.
 Captain Dickinson, Jim Bowie
 They're all present and accounted for.

Mr. Speaker, these are the lyrics to Marty Robbins' "Ballad of the Alamo."

It was there in an old beat up Spanish mission in south Texas called the Alamo on March 6, 1836, 171 years ago today, that 187 men stood defiant against oppression and tyranny. They were an odd looking bunch. They were dressed in buckskin. They had large knives, tomahawks and long rifles. They were of all races, of all States, and 13 foreign countries, including Mexico. They were facing a professional army over 20 times their size.

They were there because of the new dictator of Mexico, Santa Anna. He had abolished the democratic Mexican constitution and made himself dictator of all of Mexico.

Hispanics and Anglos living in the Texas part of Mexico wanted the Mexican constitution restored, or independence from Mexico.

Santa Anna then invaded Texas with three armies to put down the dissenters. The men at the Alamo were led by a 27-year-old lawyer from South Carolina and Alabama named William Barrett Travis.

There is a lot of legend, lore and tradition about the defense of the Alamo. But what is true, Mr. Speaker, is that the Alamo defenders believed that some things were worth living for and dying for. One of those being the word, liberty.

Being surrounded, Travis knew he could not hold off Santa Anna's army and he sent out numerous dispatches for help. I have a copy of one of those letters on my office wall. It reads, "Fellow citizens and compatriots, I am besieged by 1,000 or more of the enemy under Santa Anna. I have sustained a continual bombardment and cannon fire for over 24 hours, but I have not lost a man. The enemy has demanded surrender at its discretion, otherwise this fort will be put to the sword. I have answered that demand with a cannon shot and the flag still waves proudly over the north wall. I shall never surrender or retreat. I call upon you in the name of liberty and patriotism and everything dear to our character to come to my aid with all dispatch. If this call is neglected, I am determined to sustain myself for as long as possible and die like a soldier that never forgets what is due his honor and that of his country. Victory or death, William Barrett Travis, commander of the Alamo."

Travis held out for 5 days and 6 days and up to 13 days. But no troops ever came to help the Alamo defenders except the 32 men from Gonzales, Texas.

Eventually Travis and the boys were overwhelmed, and not one was spared by Santa Anna. But victory was expensive for the dictator Santa Anna. Travis, in his last letter from the Alamo said, "Victory will be more costly for Santa Anna than defeat." He was right. Santa Anna's losses were staggering. He also had a crippled army and lost the moral victory to the Texas war of independence.

Then on April 21, 1836, General Sam Houston routed Santa Anna's larger army at the marshes of San Jacinto. Texas became an independent nation and was so for 9 years. And Mr. Speaker, the rest, they say, is Texas history.

William Barrett Travis is my favorite person in all of history. My grandson is named Barrett Houston in his honor.

I conclude these remarks about the Alamo with Marty Robbins' closing lines:

The bugles are silent.
 There's rust on every sword.
 There's a small band of soldiers
 That lie asleep in the arms of the Lord.
 And like a statue on his pinto
 Rides a cowboy all alone.
 And he sees the cattle grazing
 Where just a century before
 Santa Anna's guns were blazing
 And the cannons used to roar.
 His eyes turn sort of misty
 And his heart begins to glow
 And then he takes his hat off slowly
 To the men of that Alamo.
 To the 13 days of glory
 At the siege of the Alamo.

Mr. Speaker, that's just the way it is.

THE ENUMERATED POWERS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak of the importance of the 10th amendment and of a bill that I have introduced each Congress since the 104th Congress, the Enumerated Powers Act. I speak today as a member of the Constitution caucus, chaired by my colleague, Congressman SCOTT GARRETT of New Jersey. It is a caucus that is dedicated and works tirelessly to illuminate the importance of the Constitution and of the 10th amendment.

The 10th amendment to the United States Constitution reads as follows: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Let me emphasize that again. "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

What that means is that the Founding Fathers intended our national government to be a limited government, a government of limited powers that cannot expand its legislative authority into areas reserved to the states or to

the people. As the final amendment in the 10 Bill of Rights, it is clear that the Constitution establishes a Federal Government of specifically enumerated and limited powers.

For that reason, as I indicated, I have introduced, each year since I have been in this Congress, the Enumerated Powers Act. This bill would require that all pieces of legislation introduced in the Congress, by a Member of Congress, would have to contain a statement setting forth the specific constitutional authority granted by the Constitution to the U.S. Congress by which that piece of legislation was to be enacted. This measure would enforce a constant and ongoing re-examination of the role of our national government.

The Enumerated Powers Act is simple. It is simply intended to require a scrutiny that we should look at what we enact and that, by doing so, we can slow the growth and reach of the Federal Government, and leave to the states or the people, those functions that were reserved to them by the Constitution.

It will perform three most important functions.

First, it would encourage Members of Congress to pause and reflect and to consider whether they propose a piece of legislation, whether it belongs at the Federal level in the allocation of powers under our U.S. Constitution, or properly belongs with the states or with the people.

Second, it would function to force us to include a statement in the legislation explaining by what authority we are acting.

And third, it would give the United States Supreme Court the ability to look at the constitutional justification for each piece of legislation, and if that constitutional justification did not stand up to scrutiny, the courts and the people would find it easier to hold the Congress accountable and to eliminate those acts which are beyond the scope of the Constitution.

In 1787, when the Founding Fathers wrote our Constitution, they created a national government with great powers but limited powers, believing that granting specific, rather than general legislative power to the national government would be a central mechanism for protecting freedom while allowing us still to achieve the objectives of a national government. As a result, the Constitution gives the Federal Government only 18 specific enumerated powers, just 18 powers.

For the largest part of our history, for the first 130 years, the Constitution served as a bulwark against excessive Federal regulation and against excessive all powerful Federal Government. Unfortunately, the restraint that Congresses demonstrated under that provision of the Constitution has largely been abandoned in the latter half of the 20th Century and now in the 21st Century.

Beginning with the New Deal, modern Congresses have displayed a willingness to ignore the 10th amendment

in order to greatly expand the Federal Government.

Let me be clear. Virtually all the measures which go beyond the scope of the powers granted to the Federal Government by the 10th amendment are well-intentioned. But unfortunately, many of them are not authorized by the Constitution. The Federal Government has ignored the Constitution and expanded its authority into every aspect of human conduct, and quite sadly, it is not doing many of those things very well.

The size and scope of the Federal Government has exploded, and there is a belief that the Federal Government can do anything. And yet, that is not what the Founding Fathers intended.

For too long, the Federal Government has operated without constitutional restraint, blatantly ignoring the principles of federalism.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting a review and a criticism and an evaluation of the proper role of the Federal Government in order to empower the American people and to distribute power as the Constitution contemplated it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SALI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SALI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about an issue that is of vital importance to Idaho's First Congressional District, my State as a whole, and the greater western region of our country.

It is critical that Congress include language in the Emergency Supplemental to reauthorize and fully fund a 1-year extension of Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000. It affects more than 615 rural counties and 4,400 schools near national forests in 39 states and literally, tens of thousands of students.

Without reauthorization, in Idaho alone, we would lose \$23.3 million in funding this next year. That is a staggering loss in my small rural state.

In order to fully understand this issue we need to go back to the final year of Theodore Roosevelt's presidency to the establishment of the 1908 Payment Act for National Forests. Under this act, the Forest Service has paid 25 percent of its gross receipts to the states for the use of roads and schools in the counties where our national forests are located. The receipts come from leases, rentals, timber sales

or other fees paid for using the National forest lands or resources. This is especially critical in Idaho, where more than 60 percent of our land is federally managed.

Congress realized at the time it was difficult for rural communities to be financially independent if they were surrounded by Federal land. If we privatized the land in those counties, they would be collecting property tax. But they cannot because the land is managed by Uncle Sam.

The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, or a bipartisan Craig-Wyden plan was passed by Congress and signed into law by President Clinton to provide funding to offset the loss of revenues to counties resulting from the severely reduced Federal timber sales in rural communities. The laws kept schools opened, roads maintained, search-and-rescue missions operating and many other essential services afloat.

The 5-year time frame of the Craig-Wyden measure was designed to allow counties sufficient time to broaden their economic bases to replace historic timber sale income. The Federal timber sale program in Idaho has, to put it mildly, come up short. Idaho's communities want to log and carefully make use of the State's timber resources, but regulatory restrictions won't let them.

□ 1730

And that is why we need to take action.

Allow me to cite one example. I have the good fortune of representing the people of Shoshone County. Shoshone County is a rural county with about 13,000 students. Shoshone County receives the second largest amount of funds under the Secure Rural Schools Act, about \$4.3 million. This is an already economically depressed community. About 75 percent of Shoshone County is in the Federal system, and yet the county is responsible to maintain more than 400 miles of public roads.

On my recent trip home just days ago, I had the opportunity to meet with Shoshone County commissioners and superintendents of public schools. For Shoshone County, losing these funds, 40 percent of their budget, means massive layoffs in an already small school system, loss of transportation for children to get to school, placing children in hazardous conditions to get to school. The road system needs constant care and maintenance. They can barely get by with what they have now.

We don't let Idahoans harvest timber. We expect them to maintain Federal roads. We provide them no fiscal relief or support. We want a top quality education for our children, but they have no economic base to raise even modest taxes.

Congress has to step in. We have to act now. First, in the short term, the solution is for Congress to approve a 1-

year extension of Craig-Wyden in the emergency supplemental. Second, while providing interim funding, Congress must come up with a long-term solution to this situation. I believe ultimately the answer lies in increasing timber harvesting.

The House Appropriations Committee will mark up the emergency supplemental this week. The emergency supplemental will be the last opportunity to address this issue before counties have to start implementing cuts to schools and services. Without a 1-year reauthorization of and funding for the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act, the predicament will be an emergency without rescue for hundreds and hundreds of rural counties across America.

I want to urge my colleagues to support this crucial 1-year extension.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT LAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, today the Federal Government owns over 30 percent of the land in this country. State and local governments and quasi-governmental agencies are controlling the other 20 percent. Half the land, 50 percent, is in some type of government or public ownership or control.

We could probably live with this, but the problem is that government at all levels keeps taking over more and more property at a faster rate than ever before.

People don't get upset unless or until their property gets taken. And it sounds great for a politician to create a park, but now we have so many parks, recreation areas, nature preserves, national forests, and on and on that we can't take care of all of them.

We are constantly being told we have a mega-billion-dollar maintenance backlog for the national parks and all these other public areas; yet we keep taking over more land. You really can never satisfy government's appetite for money or land.

We just do not teach our young people how important private property is to both our freedom and our prosperity. We see this most clearly in the fact that counties that have high percentages of public land are almost always poverty areas or at least counties with incomes far below the national average. Also, because we keep taking so much land off the tax rolls, we keep shrinking our tax base at the same time that all of the schools and government agencies tell us they need more money.

Now almost every State has gone to lotteries, casinos, or some type of gambling in a desperate attempt to get more revenue because property taxes just don't raise enough money since so much land has been taken off the tax rolls. Because of this, I believe gambling addiction is going to become a real problem in this country in the years ahead.

Another part of this problem is that government at all levels keeps putting more and more restrictions on the land that remains in private hands. The Washington Post had a headline a few months ago that said: "Judge Saves Land From Development." It might also have said: "Judge Preserves Land for Wealthy" or "Judge Keeps Young People From Buying Homes."

Preventing more land from development is driving up the cost of homeownership and putting it out of reach for many young families. It is also forcing more people into apartments or townhouses or homes on postage-stamp-size lots, leading to new problems from congestion.

The Washington Times pointed out that more than five times as much land, more than five times as much land, has been set aside as national parks, wilderness areas, Federal forests, and Federal grazing areas than has ever been developed. Today, you could put every family of four in the State of Texas and give them 3 acres of lands each and leave the whole rest of the country empty. Over three-fourths of the population lives on 3½ percent of the land.

USA Today reported last November 30 that the U.S. now has 37 million acres of private land under some type of protective trust or restrictive easement, a 54 percent increase just since 2000. Also, conservation of private land from 2000 to 2005 averaged 2.6 million acres a year, which USA Today said was almost half the size of New Jersey, each year. This is information from the Land Trust Alliance, which represents 1,200 of the 1,667 local, State, and national land trusts.

Another group, the Nature Conservancy, manages 1,400 areas in the U.S. and now has assets of \$4.14 billion. Some people will recall The Washington Post series about the sweet-heart deals the Nature Conservancy was doing for its wealthy contributors and board members. The Nature Conservancy had income of \$1.8 billion in 2004 and 2005 and has set aside 15 million acres. According to its tax returns, the Nature Conservancy in fiscal year 2005 received over \$97 million in government grants, over \$14 million in government fees and contracts, and over \$165 million from sales of land almost all to government. All this is always reported in the news as the greatest thing since sliced bread; but unless these activities are slowed, which is very doubtful, young people will find it extremely difficult to find places to start small businesses or build new homes. Also, there will be less money

for people to travel to and enjoy all the parks, preserves, national forests, and recreation areas we already have.

Mr. Speaker, if we keep taking more and more property off the tax rolls, we are going to really cut back on government services. Much worse, if we keep destroying private property and restricting development, we are going to slowly do away with the dream of homeownership and we are eventually going to bring about a lower standard of living for our children and grandchildren.

OUR MILITARY HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I have long believed that how we treat the most vulnerable in society says a great deal about who we are as a Nation. So you can imagine that I, along with tens of millions of Americans, was appalled at the recent revelations in the media about the care at the outpatient facility at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center.

Now, let me say, having visited Walter Reed more than once with my wife to visit injured Hoosier soldiers returning from battle, that there are, in fact, dedicated caregivers at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center, doctors and nurses and members of the facility staff who spend their days and nights helping the wounded. But the now infamous Building 18, a decrepit former hotel outside the main gates of Walter Reed, has come to public notice. It housed more than 80 soldiers. With moldy walls, soiled carpets, leaky pipes, mice, and cockroach infested, this facility was a national embarrassment.

I am outraged that our wounded warriors were forced to endure these terrible conditions. Our troops deserve better care, and they deserve it as soon as possible.

But more than the filthy living conditions, Mr. Speaker, the dirty secret of the military health care system in this country is that our injured veterans, after navigating the dangers of the battlefield, must navigate a bureaucratic morass to get the care they deserve. After receiving lifesaving surgeries at military facilities, wounded soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines must negotiate an overwhelming amount of red tape. I have seen it firsthand, working with families attempting to make their way through our veterans' and military health care system.

I was at the President's speech this morning at the 47th annual gathering at the American Legion as the President said that these bureaucratic delays as well as these living conditions must come to an end. The President said, "It is unacceptable to me. It is unacceptable to you. It is unacceptable to our country. And it is not going to continue."

I applaud the President and Secretary Gates for all they have done to hold the entire chain of command responsible for the conditions at Walter Reed, but we must do more to fundamentally bring reform to the system whereby we provide health care services to our veterans.

Today, the American Legion signed an agreement, for instance, with Walter Reed Army Medical Center to establish an office at the facility to assist in the transition of wounded servicemembers from the Department of Defense to the Department of Veterans Affairs. This is a good start. The hope is that the legion office will significantly alleviate the long backlogs in out-processing wounded soldiers. Thank God for these veterans who are willing to help.

As a fiscal conservative, I have long called for smaller, more accountable government. In the area of military health care, we need now, more than ever, more accountable government. I appreciate the President's emphasis on the need to improve the delivery of services and not just throw more money at it. Washington D.C. and especially this Congress under current management and, quite frankly, prior management often solves problems by throwing more money at it. But assuming Congress enacts the President's 2008 budget, the VA health care budget alone will be up 83 percent since he took office.

Money alone is not the answer. We must change the way we serve the medical needs of those who have served us in uniform. We need substantive reforms, and it is my hope that the Dole-Shalala Commission and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs task force that the President announced this morning are able to meet those immediate needs.

The President said, and I would echo today, "We have a moral obligation to provide the best possible care and treatment to the men and women who have served our country. They deserve it, and they're going to get it."

But let us not just solve the problem with more money, with changes in the chain of command. Let us work in a bipartisan way in this Congress to fundamentally bring changes to our health care system that serves our military, that serves our veterans, that ultimately will rise to the level that each one of them deserves.

The Old Book says if you owe debts, pay debts; if honor, then honor; if respect, then respect. One of the ways that our Nation discharges a debt that we cannot ever fully repay to those who have worn the uniform is to ensure that they receive the medical treatment that they so richly deserve. And I commit myself to that today.

THE ENUMERATED POWERS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss and to support the Enumerated Powers Act introduced by Congressman SHADEGG. The Enumerated Powers Act is most important to protect the tenth amendment. We understand that with the word "federalism."

People perhaps, though, are not so aware of where the concept of federalism originally came from. They think some brilliant founders got together in Philadelphia in 1789 and came up with the idea of federalism, but, in fact, that is not quite true.

The concept of federalism dates way, way back to 18 years after the arrival of the Pilgrims in the Plymouth Colony. It goes to the time when the State of Connecticut was being founded and a great preacher by the name of Hooker preached a series of sermons outlining how the government in Connecticut should be structured. Those sermons resulted in what was called then the "Fundamental Orders of Connecticut." And what it said was that Hartford had certain enumerated powers and of anything not specifically enumerated for Hartford to handle, the other towns would have those powers.

So it was that we started with the idea of federalism, that is, that there is only specific power granted to the central organizing authority, in this case the U.S. Constitution.

□ 1745

Now, the Enumerated Powers Act requires that all bills introduced in the U.S. Congress include a statement setting forth the specific constitutional authority under which the law is being enacted. It would, of course, enforce, then, the reexamination of the proper role of the national government and it will fundamentally alter the ever-expanding reach of the Federal Government. The Enumerated Powers Act requires scrutiny of the Federal Government to slow this reach, particularly in the sense that it will require that there be a properly cited constitutional authority to precede the legislation proposed.

Now, the Constitution gives the Federal Government only 18 specific enumerated powers. But ignoring the principles of Federalism in the Constitution, starting with FDR and continuing through LBJ's Great Society right down to the modern day, Congresses have displayed a willingness to ignore the 10th Amendment in order to greatly expand the Federal Government.

The size and scope of the national government has exploded over the last seven decades. Congress has created ineffective costly programs, incredible annual deficits and a huge debt exceeding \$7 trillion that will be passed only to our children and grandchildren. State and local governments are now dependent upon the Federal Government for funding, and the Feds now tamper with issues that are best understood by States and localities, with education and welfare reform being two cases in point.

I believe that Ronald Reagan had it right: "I have always felt that the nine most terrifying words in the English language are, 'I'm from the government and I'm here to help.'"

We need to uphold the entire Constitution, not just the parts we choose to use for our own ends.

UMBRAGE TAKEN AT COMMENTS REGARDING DEMISE OF VICE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I was watching television last night, I think it was the O'Reilly Show, I am not sure exactly, but I believe it was the Bill O'Reilly Show on Fox Network, and they had an excerpt of another show from which were taken some remarks by a well-known comedian and political advocate in which he was inferring that the country would be better off if the Vice President of the United States died. I took great umbrage at that. I was very, very upset about that, because Vice President CHENEY has been an outstanding servant of this country for a long, long time.

I had the pleasure of serving with Vice President CHENEY when he served in this body as the Republican whip. He worked very hard in the Ford administration as the chief of staff. I don't know that anybody has ever really been able to question his integrity, because he is a man of integrity, and he has been trying his best to assist the President of the United States in dealing with some very, very troubling issues, not the least of which are the war against terror and the war in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I won't mention the comedian, the political pundit, who made the remarks on television on HBO just recently, but I will just say that I think it is very, very bad taste for anyone to infer, even infer, that the Vice President of the United States, Mr. CHENEY, who has done such an outstanding job for this country over a long period of time, should be better off dead. That was the inference that was made. I think it was wrong, and I hope that doesn't happen in the future.

I may take issue with political leaders on the other side of the aisle, and I may very much in very severe ways disagree with them, but in no way would I ever indicate that they should be better off under the ground than on top of the ground, even though we have severe differences. And for anyone to infer that the Vice President should die really, really bothers me, especially in this time we are in, these very troubling times.

Vice President CHENEY is a great man. He has done an outstanding job for this country and he should be respected, even if you disagree with him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PAUL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GOHMERT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURGESS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

BLUE DOG COALITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, this evening, as every Tuesday evening, I rise on behalf of the 43 member strong fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition. We are a group of fiscally conservative Democrats that are doing our best to restore common sense and fiscal discipline to our Federal Government. Part of that is accountability.

This evening I am pleased to be joined by another gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. BERRY, from Arkansas's First Congressional District, as we talk about restoring not only common sense and fiscal discipline to our national government, but accountability to our Federal agencies.

Mr. Speaker, a week ago, Saturday, February 24, 2007, at about three in the afternoon, not one but two tornadoes devastated the rural delta county of Desha County. The county seat is Arkansas City. It was spared. McGehee was spared for the most part. But Dumas, a town of about 5,000 people, was hit, and hit hard, as you can see from this photo provided to me by Agnes Ross at the Dumas Clarion. This is what was left of the Fred's Dollar Store. My district director's dad was in the meat locker of the grocery store, Matt Butcher, next door, which was also destroyed. In fact, Mr. Speaker, 150 homes were either destroyed or

heavily damaged. Depending on whose numbers you want to rely on, somewhere between 600 and 800 workers were displaced from work, because wherever they worked was destroyed or heavily damaged. That community of Dumas and much of Desha County went without power for five days.

It was bad enough that the Governor cut short his trip to the National Governor's Association meeting here in Washington and flew home, and I was privileged to join him in going to Dumas and spending the afternoon visiting folks and reassuring folks that help was on the way. It was bad enough that the Governor called out 150 members of the Arkansas National Guard.

That was February 24, 2007. More than a week later, the President still has not declared Desha County a Federal disaster area and FEMA has not responded to my request to move 150 mobile homes that were purchased for Hurricane Katrina to Dumas and Desha County to be used for temporary housing while these good folks in this forgotten delta county get their lives put back together and rebuild their homes.

Mr. Speaker, this is one example of the damage. Again 150 National Guard soldiers called out; 150 people's homes either destroyed or severely damaged; 600 to 800 workers temporarily displaced from their job because wherever they worked was destroyed or heavily damaged; no power for 5 days. And yet the Federal Emergency Management Agency says that this forgotten delta county, Desha County, is not worthy of a Federal disaster declaration. They want to talk about all these rules and regulations and all this bureaucratic this and bureaucratic that.

You would expect that from the IRS, Mr. Speaker, you would expect that from most Federal agencies. But when I think of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, when I think of FEMA, I think of first responder. I think of one Federal agency that should be able to cut through the bureaucratic red tape and get something done. If FEMA can't do it, no Federal agency can do it, and FEMA is not.

I guess what infuriates me more is a week after these two tornadoes struck Dumas and Desha County, and here is another good photo of one of the houses that was destroyed, we can't convince FEMA that that home is destroyed, but we believe it was destroyed, it is certainly uninhabitable, but what gets me is, a week ago Saturday, the tornadoes hit Dumas. The President has yet to declare it a Federal disaster area, FEMA has yet to help with temporary housing, or anything else, for that matter, and yet the following Saturday, and my heart goes out to the people in Alabama and Georgia, we were fortunate in Dumas and Desha County, we did not have a loss of life. We did have a couple of dozen injuries, some of them very serious, but the good Lord was working overtime in Dumas, Arkansas, a week ago Saturday. There is no doubt about that. Peo-

ple go through and tour this town and they scratch their head. How in the world did no one die? And for those who did die in those tornadoes that came about a week later in Georgia and Alabama, our heart goes out for those people.

But it really galled me to see the director of FEMA with the President in Alabama and Georgia holding hands singing "Kumbaya" and talking about the new and improved FEMA. The new and improved FEMA has forgotten this delta county.

And this story gets better, and is hard to believe. But you can see here, this is one of the 150 homes that is either destroyed or badly damaged. Dumas is a rural community. It is not like there are a lot of rental houses available there. People, even those with insurance, need a place to live while they get their life put back together and their homes rebuilt, which could take up to a year. And this story gets better, or a better word, this story gets more tragic. Some of you are aware of this, Mr. Speaker.

When Hurricane Katrina hit the gulf coast in August 2005, one of the first things FEMA did was they ordered thousands of brand new, fully furnished mobile homes; not the camper trailers. We are talking brand new, fully-furnished mobile homes, 14 to 16 foot wide, 60 foot long, built-in microwaves, coffee tables, end tables, sofas, dining room sets, built-in central heat and air with the unit ready to drop out of the back. Most of them are equipped, or filled, I should say, with Ashley furniture.

Hope, Arkansas, because it is the old proving grounds from World War II, and it is an old military airport and they had some inactive runways and tarmacs, well, FEMA approached the City of Hope, which is also in my district. Hope used to be known as the birthplace of President Clinton. Now we are known as the largest trailer park in the world.

So FEMA entered into an agreement with the City of Hope to store these mobile homes in Hope. Not store. Actually, it was to be a FEMA staging area where they would transition through there on their way from wherever they purchased them to the gulf coast region. That was shortly after August 2005, Hurricane Katrina.

They kept delivering these mobile homes to Hope. They kept bringing more and more mobile homes to Hope. This an aerial photo that I took Saturday. This is current. I took this Saturday at the Hope Airport from a small plane. This is a current aerial photo.

All these white things, those are mobile homes that were purchased for Hurricane Katrina victims August 2005. And the staging area quickly became a storage area where more and more mobile homes arrived, but none of them ever left. Why? Because, at the time, FEMA said, oh, we don't place mobile homes in flood plains.

Well, they knew that they don't place mobile homes in flood plains be-

fore they bought them. And guess what? Everybody that lost their home in Hurricane Katrina and needed a home lived in a floodplain. So these homes were never placed.

Then President Bush was at the Democratic Caucus last month at Williamsburg, and he and I talked about this after the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, BENNIE THOMPSON, questioned him specifically about these mobile homes, and the President told me, we are saving them for future disasters.

In Dumas, Arkansas, a week ago Saturday, the people were struck not by one but by two tornadoes; 150 homes destroyed or badly damaged; 600 to 800 workers out of work because wherever they worked has been destroyed or heavily damaged; 150 members of the Arkansas National Guard called out; and yet, that was a week ago Saturday, on Monday, the Governor and I toured Dumas and on Tuesday at 9 a.m. in a conference call I asked David Paulison, the Director of FEMA, to release 150 of these 8,420 mobile homes. That is how many are currently at the Hope Airport from the photo taken Saturday. There is 8,420 of these parked at the airport in Hope today.

I respectfully requested 150 of these be moved to Dumas, which is only 3 hours away, to provide temporary housing for the people of Dumas and Desha County while they rebuild their homes.

□ 1800

I am still waiting on an answer. So I called him back again Thursday. He still couldn't give me an answer. They still have not declared this forgotten delta county a Federal disaster, and they have yet to move a single one of these mobile homes. If what I saw in Dumas is not a Federal disaster, Mr. Speaker, I doubt we will ever see another Federal disaster again.

And, Mr. Speaker, if they refuse to move 150 of these 8,420 mobile homes from Hope to Dumas to help folks, isn't that what FEMA is supposed to be in the business of doing? Then do you really believe any of these will ever be moved for the public good to help people? It is reprehensible; I am appalled by it. I am ashamed of our government, Mr. Speaker. This is a symbol of what is wrong with FEMA. This is a symbol of why so many people in this country have given up on their Federal Government.

And the story gets better. Shortly after Hurricane Katrina and all these mobile homes showed up in Hope and they weren't moving them to the people that needed them on the gulf coast, Mr. Speaker, I spoke up and brought a photo similar to this to the House floor and I said, FEMA, if you do not move these homes to the people who need them on the gulf coast, they are going to start sinking into the cow pasture, the hay meadow, thinking that would get FEMA off high center and they would start moving them to the people

that needed them. What did FEMA do? They showed up with \$7 million worth of gravel to put under them. Folks, you cannot make this up; it is too unbelievable.

And so if I appear frustrated this evening, I am because a week ago Monday, Governor Beebe and I toured Dumas and the Back Gate community. And in Back Gate, at least a week ago, and perhaps tonight, there were 30 people crowded in a metal building, calling it home because they have no place to live. I talked to Agnes Ross at the Dumas Clarion earlier today and she said she ran into somebody on the streets of Dumas earlier today, an elderly woman that had no place to go, no place to live, and yet 8,420 brand new, fully furnished mobile homes are sitting there at the airport in Hope, Arkansas, 3 hours from Dumas.

When the Blue Dog Coalition talks about restoring accountability to our government and making Federal agencies answer for their action, or a lack of action, this is a good example. This is about as good as it gets. And, Mr. Speaker, I am not here to beat up the President or beat up the director of FEMA. I tried for a week to go through the proper channels and get this done, but for the life of me I am imploring the President and the director of FEMA, Mr. Speaker, to move just a few of those mobile homes from Hope to Dumas to help these folks, provide them temporary housing while they try to get their lives put back together and their homes rebuilt.

MARION BERRY, a Congressman from the First District of Arkansas, is from Gillette. He doesn't live but a few miles from Dumas. He knows these people, too. This storm affected his area, and he is very aware of what is going on and the lack of attention from FEMA. At this time I would yield to him. I want to thank him for joining me this evening to talk about trying to help the folks of Dumas and Desha County, this forgotten delta county.

Mr. BERRY. I thank the gentleman from south Arkansas, and I certainly appreciate his leadership in this matter.

I would also encourage everyone that can hear my voice to keep in our hearts and minds and certainly in your prayers our men and women in uniform, especially those on the battlefield this evening. Reach out to them and their families and let them know that you understand and appreciate the sacrifice and commitment they make out of the goodness of their hearts.

My esteemed colleague from south Arkansas is absolutely correct. We have these horrible tornados almost every year in Arkansas. We had two in the First Congressional District that I am privileged to represent last year. We have had as many as a hundred in one day all across Arkansas.

I have served in this Congress since 1997, and from 1997 to January of 2001 we had a director of FEMA that remains distinguished to this day and al-

ways will. His name was James Lee Witt. He knew how to run an agency. He didn't make excuses. When a tornado hit, you didn't have to call FEMA, you didn't have to call the director, you didn't have to call anybody. They would just show up, Johnny-on-the-spot. They knew what they were doing. They were trained. They could make decisions. They helped people start putting their lives together. They helped communities and local governments clean up the mess. They provided the necessary financing to get the economy going again. They worked with the public schools to get them repaired and back in order.

Today, FEMA is a worse disaster than the storms. If they show up at all, which they haven't in Desha County, and my colleague, Mr. ROSS, is absolutely right, I just live right across the river from Desha County, it is part of my home. Today, if they show up at all, it is for a photo op. I saw this past Saturday on CNN, FEMA has a new truck, a communications truck. They were so proud. They were explaining that this communications truck, and I would love to know how much it cost, was the secret to their success because they were going to be able to use that truck to take pictures and broadcast them back to FEMA headquarters and they would get the same information they could have gotten from CNN 3 hours ago. All of this would be hysterically funny if it was not so tragic.

This is not a funding issue. It is just a simple matter of incompetence from the top to the bottom. This administration simply does not know how to run a government agency.

I have not talked to Mr. Paulson. I have talked to him on previous occasions, and he defines the word "bureaucrat," which is a sad thing to have to say about anyone. It is the job of the Congress to hold these people accountable.

I have had conversations with Secretary Chertoff. And he assures me that these trailers that are down in Hope, we are going to take care of those. This was over a year ago. He appeared before the Appropriations Committee and explained that in just a few months these were all going to be moved out and everything was going to be wonderful. They are just sitting down there going to ruin. Nobody is using them. But they wouldn't let the victims of tornados in my district last year use them. They won't let the good people of Desha County use them this year. This just doesn't make any sense.

It is the job of the Congress, and that is the reason my colleagues and I are here this evening, to begin the process to hold these incompetent bureaucrats accountable for the terrible way they are running this agency. For crying out loud, if you can't do anything else, give us a "no" answer. Tell us something. Don't just let it stay out there and twist in the wind.

I can tell you this: You don't have to be all broke out in brilliance to look at

these pictures or drive through that community and know a terrible disaster took place, and they are deserving of the help of the Federal Government. What a sad thing it is to go from an agency and a government only 6 years ago that would come to the aid of the people when a disaster happened, to this horrible mess that we call FEMA today that is so incompetent all they can do is spend money where it doesn't help the people. It is time that they at least appeared before this Congress and make some kind of a pathetic explanation as to why they are operating the way they are at this time. And let's hope that by some stroke the administration and the White House, who is ultimately in charge, will at least have the credibility and feel responsible enough to get control of that agency, because we know there will be more disasters that will happen to the American people, and we are going to need help from our Federal Government.

We cannot continue to operate this way. What a sad thing it is to see this agency and the way they treat people who have had their lives destroyed, their jobs destroyed, their homes destroyed, and yet they are not even deemed worthy by the director of FEMA or the Secretary of Homeland Security of a little bit of help and a little bit of recognition by the Federal Government so they can get some help on their own.

And can you imagine, if the Secretary of Homeland Security can't see that FEMA works, can you imagine the mess that the rest of Homeland Security is in? What a terrifying thought that these people are in charge of anything, but certainly in charge of our homeland security and in charge of the very Federal agency that is charged with bringing assistance and helping the people when these tragedies take place.

I would join my colleague in recognizing tragedies that took place in Alabama and Georgia and the loss of life and how terrible that was, and we hope they get treated better. They certainly deserve to be treated well. They deserve all the help it is possible to give them at this time.

Let's hope that we are not back here in 2 weeks to hear stories from Alabama and Georgia about how, well, FEMA came and they had their picture made with us and they gave us a big hug, and then they left and nothing happened. They deserve better. And let's hope that they get better. We also deserve to have help for the people in Desha County in south Arkansas in the First Congressional District. They deserve to be treated better, also.

And, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that my colleague, Mr. ROSS, will not rest, nor will the Arkansas delegation, nor will the Governor of the State of Arkansas rest until we see the recovery taking place and the wonderful community of Dumas, Arkansas, begin to be restored and the economy begins to prosper again, and the people begin to put their lives back together.

I thank my colleague for his leadership, and I will yield back.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for joining me this evening and talking about the lack of accountability within the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

To recount, February 24, 2007, a week ago Saturday, not one, but two tornadoes devastated the town of Dumas and the Back Gate community in Desha County. The Governor declared it a State disaster, called out 150 members of the Arkansas National Guard who were there for nearly a week. It took crews of more than a hundred working for 5 days to restore electricity to that delta county. Some 600 to 800 people remain out of work because of the damage done to their workplace. And yet here we are, a week ago Saturday in Dumas, horrible tornadoes. And the ironic thing is that FEMA has a staging area with 8,420 brand new fully furnished mobile homes 3 hours away, filled with Ashley furniture and built-in microwaves ready to be set up, and the mayor and the county judge, Marion Gill, the mayor of Dumas, Mark McElroy, the county judge in Desha County, they have got sites available. The zoning is cleared with city water, with water and electrical and sewer hook-ups, and yet FEMA, which is supposed to be in the business of helping people, refused to move a single one of these to the more than 150 people who lost their home, like this family right here.

□ 1815

This is one of the 150 homes that were either totally destroyed or heavily damaged. Yes, some of these folks had insurance, but yes, we have 8,420 mobile homes 3 hours away that are not doing anybody any good sitting at the airport in a hay meadow. They were purchased to help people.

There is no place to rent in Dumas. These folks in Dumas and Desha County need a place to live temporarily. We are not asking that they give these mobile homes to them. We are asking for temporary assistance. That is what FEMA is in the business of or supposed to be. Allow these folks to temporarily live in 150 of these 8,420 brand new mobile homes, filled with Ashley furniture.

They are not doing anybody good in Hope. Let us get them moving, Mr. Speaker, to Dumas, Arkansas, and let these folks in Dumas who lost their homes or had their homes heavily damaged live in them temporarily while they get their life put back together and rebuild their homes.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time we have raised this issue. Here is the timeline, talk about accountability and restoring accountability to our government: Saturday, February 24, two tornadoes devastated the communities of Dumas and Back Gate in Desha County. Monday, February 26, I surveyed the damage on the ground and in the air along with Governor

Beebe and other elected officials. Governor Beebe named Desha County a State disaster area and announced his plans to request a Federal disaster declaration.

Tuesday, February 27, I held a conference call with FEMA Director David Paulison, along with Senator LINCOLN from Arkansas and staff for Senator PRYOR. In the call, I conveyed my support of Governor Beebe and requested FEMA expedite their decision and action as well as encouraged FEMA to use 150 manufactured homes from this supply of 8,420 of them from Hope, Arkansas, just 3 hours away, for the families without shelter in Desha County.

Later Tuesday, my staff talked with FEMA again regarding the status of the disaster declaration, and they expressed that they did not read the laws as we did and that they are still working with Arkansas to gather information. In other words, the bureaucracy began.

Wednesday, February 28, I joined with both senators, Senator LINCOLN and Senator PRYOR from Arkansas in sending a letter to President Bush and FEMA Director Paulison supporting Governor Beebe's request for a Federal disaster declaration.

Thursday, March 1, 2007, I again talked with FEMA Director Paulison regarding the lack of a response and movement of these mobile homes from Hope and expressed my displeasure with his office. It had been 6 days since the tornadoes and the communities were just beginning to regain electricity in parts of the town. At that point, FEMA says the reason for not declaring a disaster area is the high rate of insured homes and the fact that the State is capable of taking care of the damage.

Supposedly, they told CNN, FEMA did, that the State has a surplus this year, and they do not need their help. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is the craziest thing I have ever heard of. The city and county is a very rural area. It is in the delta region. They lost half their sales tax base when a big retail store left about a year ago. They had a Fred's Dollar Store and a grocery store left, and they have been destroyed. They have, at least for a short period of time, perhaps up to a year, lost much of their tax base. At the same time, they are struggling to pay for a new county hospital and new city hospital there in Dumas, and they are not getting any help from the one agency that we thought was supposed to be there to help us in the time of need, the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

Friday, March 2, 2007, I again joined with Senators LINCOLN and PRYOR to send another letter to FEMA in support of Governor Beebe and the immediate need for mobile homes in Desha County.

Saturday, March 3, during an address in Memphis, Tennessee, at the 55th Annual Mid-South Farm and Cotton Gin show, I commented on the lack of response from FEMA one week after the tornadoes.

I went to Hope, and I stood in front of these 8,420 mobile homes to highlight the waste of taxpayers' money, the fact that these brand new, fully furnished manufactured homes are just 3 hours away from Dumas, yet they are not being put to good use. They are not helping the people some 3 hours away in Dumas.

Then, Tuesday, March 5, 2007, that is today, I joined Senators LINCOLN and PRYOR in sending a letter in support of Governor Beebe's request to the U.S. Small Business Administration to request small business disaster loans be administered in Desha County to help the 25 businesses which were destroyed and the more than 800 employees who are now without a job or a place to work nearby, some 600 to 800 depending on which day it is and which businesses are able to get back up.

My office hand delivered letters from me and photos I took, this photo right here. We delivered an 8x10 copy of this photo along with a letter today to President Bush, to FEMA Director Paulison, and to the Department of Homeland Security Secretary Chertoff, making one final plea to assist these folks in this forgotten delta county.

Well, we have gone on long enough on this, Mr. Speaker, but I think it is important. As members of the Blue Dogs, we talk about accountability, and you cannot talk about accountability and the lack of it without talking about FEMA. Again 8,420 brand new mobile homes sitting there at the Hope airport, not doing anybody any good, and I have got 150 homes either totally destroyed or damaged like one 3 hours away.

It has been more than a week. FEMA refuses to send a single mobile home to assist these folks. If they are not going to move them 3 hours away to a disaster area, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you these mobile homes will never be put to the public good. They will never go to help people if they are not going to help people 3 hours away in their time of need.

I am, once again, Mr. Speaker, imploring the President and the director of FEMA and the Secretary of Homeland Security to do the right thing and to get some of these mobile homes moving to Dumas, where tonight 30 people are living in a metal building. They need our help, Mr. Speaker.

That is what the Blue Dog Coalition is all about. We are about trying to restore common sense and fiscal discipline to our national government, and we are about accountability.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, we have what is called the Iraq War Accountability Act, and we are going to be talking about that more this evening.

Mr. Speaker, as you walk the halls of Congress, it is easy to know when you are walking by an office that belongs to a member of the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition. Why? Because you will see this poster. A poster reminding Members of Congress and reminding the people who

walk the halls of Congress that our Nation is in debt.

Today, the U.S. national debt is \$8,811,969,377,773 and some change, and if you divide that by every man, woman and child in America, your share, Mr. Speaker, of the national debt is \$29,245. It is time that this Nation get its fiscal house in order, and one of the ways we do that is by restoring accountability to our Federal agencies, which is what this business with FEMA is all about, trying to restore accountability and common sense and cutting through the bureaucracy and red tape to help people in their time of need.

At this time, it is a pleasure for me to yield to my friend from the State of Ohio (Mr. WILSON). We are pleased to have Mr. WILSON as a new Member of the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition, and at this time, I recognize Mr. WILSON.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe when the Katrina accident happened that we were out of line as much as we were and not responsive, as has been indicated here this evening, and it is even harder to believe that after the correction of that, we are back in the same boat again.

I know they changed FEMA directors. Mr. Brown was terminated and went on. And then now we have a new group of people running FEMA, but it does not seem to be any better.

Mr. Speaker, the Blue Dogs stand for accountability. We stand for accountability in a lot of different ways. We feel that there are some truly misguided priorities that are hurting our country and hurting us as people here.

Mr. Speaker, just Sunday evening, millions of Americans watched "60 Minutes." We heard what the Blue Dogs have been talking about for more than a decade.

In the report, the U.S. Comptroller General, the Nation's top accountant, urged people to wake up to our budget crisis before it is too late. These are his words, Mr. Speaker.

"What's going on right now is we're spending more money than we make." Couldn't be much more simple. "We're charging it to a credit card and expecting our grandchildren to pay."

Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely wrong. The Comptroller General is absolutely right. Our fiscal mess is outrageous, and we as Blue Dogs stand for accountability. Reckless budgets and irresponsible spending has got us into the fix we are in, and now it is the responsibility of this Congress to help us get out.

The administration has had misguided priorities that have been painfully clear. They send pallets of cash to Iraq while our veterans at home suffer in dirty, broken-down facilities, not getting the medical care that they need after putting their life on the line for our country. Recent reports of the deplorable conditions and the roach-infested rooms at Walter Reed are an

outrage, and they are unacceptable. Mr. Speaker, it is an understatement to say that our brave veterans deserve so much more than the way they are being treated.

We must hold this administration accountable for this reckless approach that has allowed millions of dollars to go missing in Iraq while our brave young men and women who need proper medical care have gone without it. We must provide real oversight to keep this from happening again, just like we need to provide real oversight as we work for a responsible budget.

Mr. Speaker, what will happen if we do not clean up this fiscal mess? We only need to listen to the words of the Comptroller General again in last Sunday's "60 Minutes" presentation. He said, "We suffer from a fiscal cancer. It's growing within" our country. "And if we do not treat it, it could have catastrophic consequences for" America.

As Blue Dogs, Mr. Speaker, we will shine a bright light on this cancer and nurse our budget back to health. Our future and the future of our children and our grandchildren depend on it.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WILSON), an important member of the fiscally conservative Blue Dog Coalition, for sharing your thoughts with us this evening as we try to, Mr. Speaker, talk about the need to restore fiscal discipline and accountability to our government. You gave a good example of putting an end to the debt and the deficit spending, and we have had examples this evening about restoring accountability to government, and the accountability and lack of it within FEMA.

We are going to hear about other areas where we need to restore accountability within our Federal Government this evening, and we will talk some about the Blue Dog Coalition's Iraq War Accountability Act.

We support our troops. In fact, we support them so much we want to make sure this \$12 million an hour that is being sent to Iraq of your hardearned tax money, Mr. Speaker, is going to support our men and women in uniform. Unfortunately, as we have learned, much of it is not, and that is why we have this legislation, H.R. 97, the Iraq War Accountability Act.

Mr. Speaker, if you have got any comments, questions or concerns for us, you can e-mail us at bluedog@mail.house.gov. That is bluedog@mail.house.gov.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to another member of the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition, the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS), my good friend, who every day is working to represent the constituents of his State.

I share, too, the concerns with the lack of accountability that has taken place over the last 4 years as we have

put America's finest men and women in uniform in harm's way, fighting this war on terrorism, but specifically in Iraq and Afghanistan, and only to find that too often we have not done the necessary planning, we have not put the necessary resources in place nor have we taken the time to ensure that their work is focused on in a way that brings results, the kind of results that all Americans as taxpayers want to see when we invest in our Nation's interests.

The Iraq Accountability Act is an important step to try to reinstate credibility through this war effort, and therefore, we are urging our colleagues throughout the House to embrace this effort. This is not a partisan issue. This is all about making sure that when we invest \$25 billion in reconstruction, when we need that kind of investment here at home, that it, in fact, is not taken in by sole source contracting single bids; that, in fact, that the work actually takes place at a level of quality so that the Iraqi government or the citizens can, in fact, benefit from that investment of infrastructure.

□ 1830

We just saw recently about the construction of a police station that was so shoddily built with U.S. taxpayers dollars that, in fact, it has been deemed unusable.

So as fellow Blue Dog members, we really urge in a bipartisan basis for us as a House to come together. We are the people's House, after all, and it is important that we put partisan politics at the water's edge. We are in a real mess in Iraq. There is no doubt about that. I have every hope, as do most Americans, that, in fact, we do the right thing in ensuring that this effort takes place in a way that brings our American troops home as safely and as quickly as possible.

However, if this surge is not successful, as I asked Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice in the Foreign Affairs Committee just 2 weeks ago, that I think it is absolutely critical that we understand what our backup plan is. I think the American public is getting tired of us pursuing these efforts without the sort of time invested effort that is going to ensure that if this effort is not successful, we have a backup and that we are not simply winging it, because I think too often that has been the history of the recent past in this engagement.

Mr. Speaker, and my colleague, Congressman MIKE ROSS, I would like to shift this effort of accountability and transparency back to our Nation's shores. I was very moved by the comments Congressman MIKE ROSS made when he talked about the devastating impact of those tornados in his district back in Arkansas. I saw the devastation on television shortly after it occurred.

I e-mailed my friend, Congressman MIKE ROSS, and asked him how it was there. He talked about the horrific

challenges his constituents were facing, and I felt for him. I felt for him because whether we like it or not, natural disasters occur throughout the country, whether it is in Florida, whether it is Katrina in Louisiana and Mississippi. I know, because just in January we had a similar natural disaster in California, called the freeze.

This devastating freeze has now impacted the State of California over \$1.3 billion. Now, when you have a freeze that impacts communities in many counties such as we had in California in January, it doesn't take on the same sort of graphic visuals that a tornado or a hurricane does, but it is the worst freeze we have had in over 10 years. Governor Schwarzenegger immediately declared the State a disaster, an area designated as 31 counties eligible for State aid, and the State has been putting money in there.

We have signed a bipartisan letter to the President asking for Federal support. The estimate is that the freeze has affected not only \$1.3 billion in losses, and those numbers are adding up, but over 12,000 farm workers, as well as farmers, have been impacted. The livelihood of these farmers, these farm workers and the communities they live in have threatened the economies of these towns where we have had 50 percent, 70 percent unemployment just in the last 4 to 6 weeks.

I was talking to a good friend of mine, Sarah Reyes, who heads up the community foodbank back in Fresno County. She told me that in the last 6 weeks they have fed over 91,000 families, 91,000 families that don't have jobs, that are out of work. But still, even though we have sent this letter, the Governor made the declaration, 31 counties have been impacted, the administration has yet to declare the freeze a Federal disaster.

So you ask why, why is our Governor, Governor Schwarzenegger's request being ignored? Why is the letter that has been signed by both Democrats and Republicans among the California congressional delegation being disregarded? Why is the administration acting so casually about a situation that puts families out of work and family businesses at risk?

Mr. President, the freeze may not make the sort of pictures that we have seen in Florida or in Arkansas or in Louisiana or in Mississippi; but I can tell you, if you come to those communities and visit and meet with those farm workers who are out of work, you talk to those farmers and their families who have invested their entire lives in their family farm, you will see just as dramatic an impact as any devastation of any other natural disaster. So I think it is time for the administration to focus on the accountability in its efforts in California for those families that have been so impacted by this devastating freeze. Accountability is what people expect their government to do. They expect their government to solve problems.

When the President spoke here in the State of the Union in January and said that folks are less concerned about the partisan squabbling that takes place and they are more concerned about doing the people's business, I agree with the President. In fact, this is part of the people's business, being accountable, being transparent, and making sure that after action that has already taken place, clearly 6 weeks, now going on to 7 weeks, after the initial disaster, that yet we have no response from Washington.

Ladies and gentlemen, folks in California and those 31 counties expect better. My constituents expect better, and I am hopeful that soon the President and the administration will step up to the plate and take FEMA's recommendation and that the Office of Management and Budget will suggest to the President that, in fact, California is deserving of the same sort of support and response and accountability that all of our citizens expect.

I thank the gentleman from Arkansas, my dear friend and colleague, Mr. MIKE ROSS.

Mr. ROSS. An important member of the Blue Dog Coalition, a group of fiscally conservative Democrats who spends many a Tuesday night here on the floor with me talking about the need to restore common sense and fiscal discipline to our Federal Government.

Why? Because today the U.S. national debt is \$8,811,969,377,773 and some change. For every man, woman and child in America, their share, our share of the national debt is \$29,245. It is what those of us in the Blue Dog Coalition have coined as the debt tax, d-e-b-t, and that is one tax that cannot go away and cannot be cut until our Nation gets its fiscal House in order.

Why is this important? Our Nation is borrowing nearly \$1 billion a day. In addition to billing \$1 billion a day, we are spending about half a billion every day paying interest on the debt we already got before it goes up another \$1 billion today, a half a billion dollars a day. What could we do with that?

Just in my district alone, give me three days' interest on the national debt, and I could complete I-49 across the western side of Arkansas. Give me another three days' interest on the national debt, and I could complete I-69 through the delta region of south Arkansas, two important interstate road projects that could help create economic opportunities and lift up one of the poorest regions in our country.

Yet these priorities continue to go unmet. Why? Because of a lack of fiscal discipline, because too much of your hard-earned tax money is going to pay interest, not principal, but just interest on the national debt. Year after year, it is hard now to believe, but from 1998 to 2001, we had a balanced budget in this country and a surplus, the first time either a Democrat or a Republican had given us that, in about 40 years.

Yet, we have squandered that, this administration and this Republican Congress, for the past 6 years, year after year, have given us the largest deficit ever in our Nation's history and the largest debt ever in our Nation's history.

In fact, to put it in perspective, the total national debt from 1789 to 2000 was \$5.67 trillion. But for 2010, the total national debt will have increased to nearly \$11 trillion. That is a doubling of the 211-year debt in just 10 years. Interest payments on this debt are one of the fastest-growing parts of the Federal budget, the debt tax we call it, d-e-b-t; and it is one tax that cannot be repealed.

Our Nation is spending more money paying interest on national debt than we are educating our children. If that is not wrong, I don't know what is. It is morally wrong.

Well, you could see the current national debt is at an all-time high. Why do deficits matter? Because they do reduce economic growth. They burden our children and grandchildren with liabilities. They increase our reliance on foreign lenders who now own 40 percent of our debt. Mr. Speaker, this administration in the past 6 years has borrowed more money from foreign central banks and foreign investors than the previous 42 Presidents combined.

Mr. Speaker, you might be surprised at who they are. It is kind of like David Letterman and his Top 10 list. Here is the Top 10 list of people that we have gone out and borrowed money from in the last 6 years. The United States of America goes out to other countries and borrows money to fund tax cuts in this country for folks earning over \$400,000 a year.

Here is the Top 10, we have borrowed, the United States of America has borrowed, \$637.4 billion from Japan; China, \$346.5 billion; the United Kingdom, \$223.5 billion. You will love this one, OPEC, the United States of America has borrowed \$97.1 billion from OPEC; Korea, \$67.7 billion; Taiwan, \$63.2 billion; the Caribbean Banking Centers, \$63.6 billion; Hong Kong, \$51 billion; Germany, \$52.1 billion.

Rounding out the Top 10 countries, where the United States of America has gone and borrowed money from foreign central banks and foreign lenders, you will not believe this one, Mexico. The United States of America has borrowed \$38.2 billion from Mexico to fund tax cuts in this country for people who earn over \$400,000 a year.

We are trying to fix this, and in this new Democratic majority, I am proud to tell you that not in the first 100 hours, but the first 24 hours, the new Democratic leadership listened to the 43-member strong fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition and re-instituted what is known as the PAYGO rules, which means pay-as-you-go. Those were the rules that were in place on this House floor from 1998 through 2001 when President Clinton gave this Nation its last balanced budget.

Some Republicans will have you believe, oh, that means they want to raise taxes to fund a program. Not so. That means that we think you should review programs and find programs that don't work and cut them to pay for new programs. Pay-as-you-go does not mean raise taxes to fund a new program. It means restore accountability to our government, no more rubber-stamp Congress.

It means we are going to demand accountability from our Federal agencies; and when programs don't work, and when agencies don't know how to administer them, we are going to cut them and use that money to fund other programs that can work.

Well, we have talked a lot this evening about accountability, and I am real proud to be joined by one of the authors of our Iraq War Accountability Act. We support our troops. In fact, the gentleman here with me tonight, from Pennsylvania, Mr. MURPHY, is an Iraqi war veteran. My brother-in-law is serving tonight in the Middle East.

We support our troops, but we also want to make sure that this \$12 million an hour of your tax money that is being sent to Iraq is accounted for, and that it is being spent on our troops to protect them so they can return home safely.

For the remaining 5 or 10 minutes we have got this evening, I recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania, a new member but an important member of the Blue Dog Coalition, Mr. MURPHY.

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Thank you, Congressman ROSS. I will make sure that when my wife and I retire today we will pray for your brother-in-law over in the Middle East. He is one of our heroes, and we are proud of his service to the country.

I rise today to bring an end to the pattern of systemic neglect from the White House. Last November, American families sent Democrats to Congress to bring about change. There are now 49 new Members in the House of Representatives. Five of those Members are veterans. Of those five, I am proud to say they are all Democrats. I am also proud to say that three of the five are from the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in Admiral SESTAK, Commander CARNEY, and myself.

Change from the neglect our military veterans are currently experiencing, as they try to get the health care they deserve, Americans have seen now the past few days what is going on in Walter Reed. It is our opinion that this is criminal neglect.

□ 1845

But when the people voted for change in November, they voted to change from the strategy in Iraq that has American troops refereeing a civil war while too many Iraqis sit on the sidelines, and a change in the way we pay for the war in Iraq.

The American taxpayers have spent more than \$400 billion in Iraq. If they were to see an invoice, just one invoice,

taxpayers would see the widespread waste, fraud, and abuse. And that is why, as Blue Dogs, we stood together with the Iraqi Accountability Act. Fifty-eight Members of Congress agreed to this act. Congressmen ALLEN, ALTMIRE, ARCURI, BACA, BAIRD, BARROW, BEAN, BERRY, BISHOP, BOSWELL, BOYD, BOYDA, BRADY, BRALEY, CARDOZA, CASTOR, CHANDLER, COSTA, DAVIS, DONNELLY, ELLSWORTH, GILLIBRAND, GONZALEZ, HARE, HARMAN, HERSETH, HILL, HODES, HOLDEN, ISRAEL, MAHONEY, MARSHALL, MATHE-SON, MCINTYRE, MCNERNEY, MELANCON, MARCHANT, MILLER, MITCHELL, DENNIS MOORE, GWEN MOORE, PETERSON, POMEROY, ROSS, SALAZAR, SCHWARTZ, SCOTT, SHULER, TANNER, THOMPSON, WELCH, FILNER, WALZ, CLARKE, ELLISON, SIRES, HOLT, REYES.

All of these Members, all 58 Members are cosponsors to the Iraq Accountability bill, and they signed on because they have seen what is really going on. They have seen that over the past 4 years families of my district of Bucks County, Pennsylvania and northeast Philadelphia and across the country have heard a lot of bad news from Iraq.

But we are also hearing about money lost and weapons missing. Recently here in Congress we heard from the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction. He spoke to the Armed Services Committee, and he told us about \$9 billion that has simply vanished. But as many as 14,000 weapons have disappeared, weapons that could be in the enemy's hands right now. These are dollars and these are weapons that were sent to the Iraqis that have gone missing because of mismanagement and fraud. It is not just about the money, but it is also about the safety of our troops. Those missing weapons could arm an entire division of the Muqtada al-Sadr army, an entire division.

Mr. Speaker, it is long past time that we kept track of the money and the weapons that we are giving to the Iraqis and replace the fraud, waste, and abuse with proper oversight, responsibility, and accountability.

The legislation that the Blue Dogs are supporting addresses the glaring lack of oversight and accountability in Iraq and addresses how taxpayer dollars are spent on the war. It puts forward commonsense proposals that ensure that fewer resources are wasted and more resources get to the troops on the battlefield.

This legislation calls for transparency in how Iraq's war funds are spent. It urges the establishment of a Truman committee-type commission to track and curb the fraud, waste, and abuse. It calls for the Iraqi war to go through the normal budgeting process, not through emergency bills or supplementals. These are measures everyone should agree on regardless of the political party.

American families are frustrated with the war in Iraq. This legislation will go a long way toward providing

the change that we all seek and the transparency that we all deserve. It is time for answers, Mr. Speaker, and it is time for accountability, and it is time to put an end to the pattern of neglect.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his work in helping write the Iraq War Accountability Act, which calls for transparency on how Iraq war funds are spent. It creates a Truman-like commission to investigate the awarding of contracts, the need to fund the Iraq war through the normal appropriations process and not the so-called emergency supplementals that hide the funding, and using American resources to improve Iraqi assumption of internal policing operations. Another example of how the Blue Dogs are leading the way, Mr. Speaker, in trying to restore accountability to our government here at home as well as in Iraq.

And in closing, Mr. Speaker, as I began this Special Order this evening, I talked about the terrible tornadoes that devastated Dumas and Desha Counties in my district, and I enter into the RECORD two letters addressed to the President, one February 28 and one March 5, 2007.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, February 28, 2007.

Hon. GEORGE W. BUSH,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing to support Governor Mike Beebe's request for a Presidential declaration of major disaster for Desha County in Arkansas. Currently, the State of Arkansas and local communities are beginning the process of recovering from the heavy rains, high winds, and tornadoes that touched down in Arkansas on Saturday, February 23rd. Pursuant to the provisions of Section 501(a) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, we ask that the State of Arkansas receive a federal disaster designation for the damage assessed in Desha County.

As you are probably aware, we represent a predominantly rural state where municipal governments are often ill-equipped to respond to disasters of this magnitude. We have no doubt that all available resources at the state and local level are being used, but federal assistance will be needed to help the affected communities recover.

We would also like to specifically request that Desha County be approved for the FEMA Individuals & Households Program (IHP) to include Temporary Housing and assistance with Mobile Homes and Travel Trailers, Small Business Administration disaster loans, and Direct Federal Assistance. The availability of rental property is restricted with the closest jurisdiction being approximately 45 miles.

As you know, many of the manufactured homes and travel trailers purchased by FEMA for use in the Hurricane Katrina disaster are currently sitting unused in Hope, Arkansas. It is our belief that these manufactured homes and travel trailers should be made available to those Arkansans left homeless by Saturday's storms. The inability of FEMA to find a permanent home for these manufactured homes and travel trailers in areas affected by Katrina has been a source of frustration for the Arkansas delegation and our constituents. However, their close proximity to the disaster in our state provides a perfect opportunity to put some of them to a good use.

Mr. President, we respectfully request your swift consideration and approval of this request. If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

BLANCHE L. LINCOLN.
MARK PRYOR.
MIKE ROSS.

MARCH 5, 2007.

Hon. GEORGE W. BUSH
*President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT, I am writing to you because I have great concerns regarding the lack of a federal disaster declaration for Desha County, Arkansas, and the desperate need for temporary housing for this storm-ravaged Delta County.

On February 24, 2007, two terrible tornadoes hit the towns of Dumas and Back Gate in Desha County, Arkansas. While my heart goes out to the people in Alabama and Georgia who were recently hit by deadly tornadoes, I write to you because I am concerned that the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has now forgotten about our situation in Arkansas. The tornadoes that passed through our state destroyed or heavily damaged more than 150 homes; caused 800 people to be out of work because 25 businesses were destroyed; required the Governor to send in the National Guard to enforce security and for clean up purposes; and forced the town to be without electrical power for five days. In this small town, with an estimated population of 5,300, this level of damage and destruction has been overwhelming.

Desha County has still not been declared a federal disaster area, and one of my greatest concerns is the fact that there is no alternative housing for those residents who have been displaced. Nearly 9,000 brand new, fully furnished mobile homes sit less than three hours away at a FEMA staging area in Hope, Arkansas, and all I ask that you make wise use of our taxpayers' money and instruct FEMA Director David Paulison to move 150 of these mobile homes to Desha County for temporary housing.

Last week, I toured the devastation in Desha County with Governor Mike Beebe and strongly supported his request to you for a federal disaster declaration to assist those businesses and individuals that have been damaged or left without shelter. I also joined Arkansas's U.S. Senators Blanche Lincoln and Mark Pryor in support of that request. At that time FEMA Director Paulison informed me in a phone conversation that the Governor's request had been passed on from the FEMA Region VI office to FEMA's Washington, DC office and was pending his review.

Mr. President, as you and I spoke a month ago at the House Democratic Caucus Retreat in Williamsburg, Virginia, the need to put to use the nearly 9,000 brand new, fully furnished mobile homes stored in Hope could not be greater. It has now been more than a week since these storms hit our state, and I respectfully request that you do what is right and declare Desha County, Arkansas, a federal disaster area. Such a declaration would enable area businesses to take advantage of federal resources and allow you to begin moving mobile homes from the Hope Airport to Desha County for temporary housing.

I have toured the devastation in Desha County and seen first-hand the effects of this storm. I have also enclosed a photo taken Saturday of the nearly 9,000 fully furnished mobile homes purchased for Hurricane Katrina victims but never used that sit unused in Hope, Arkansas. I again ask that you declare Desha County a federal disaster area and make 150 mobile homes available so that

victims can have access to temporary emergency shelter. This is the right thing to do and I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

MIKE ROSS.

THE OFFICIAL TRUTH SQUAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that recognition. I want to thank the leadership on the Republican side for the opportunity to address once again the House of Representatives and talk about some important issues that our Nation is dealing with, and bring the latest version of the Official Truth Squad. This is a group of folks who have determined to try to bring some sunlight and some truth to the issues that we talk about here in Washington. And after the last hour, Mr. Speaker, a lot of truth needs to be shed, because the amount of misinformation and disinformation that our friends on the other side of the aisle have put forward needs to be corrected, and so we are here as the Official Truth Squad to do just that. It is a great privilege, and I want to thank the Republican Conference, the Republican leadership for that opportunity.

The Official Truth Squad started as a group of freshmen last term who were frustrated by, as I said, the disinformation and the misinformation that was perpetrated and brought forward on this House floor day after day after day after day, and we thought that it was appropriate to get together and attempt to bring some light to issues, attempt to bring some facts to issues. And we have a favorite quote.

We have a lot of favorite quotes, but one of our favorite quotes is indeed one of my favorite quotes that I think crystallizes exactly what the mission is here. And in Washington it is so difficult to try to get to the second clause of this sentence. But this is from Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Senator Moynihan, a former United States Senator from the State of New York and a former United States representative of the United Nations, a wonderful gentleman, a very wise individual. And he said, "Everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but not their own facts." Everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but not their own facts.

So it is in that spirit, Mr. Speaker, that we come to the floor tonight and talk about a number of issues, and try to shed some of that light, try to bring some facts to the table.

We get visited oftentimes here in Washington by folks who are constituents, folks from back home. They come here and they visit us, and they talk about the kinds of issues that are important to them. And today, Mr. Speaker, and yesterday in Washington we have been visited, all of us have

been visited, I know, by members of the VFW, by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. And it is very humbling to sit and to talk with members of the VFW, to listen to their stories, to hear their concerns, to appreciate the challenges that they have and the issues that they believe Congress ought to be addressing.

These are truly heroes. They are truly heroes from previous conflicts that our Nation has been involved in. And it is distressing when you talk to these members of the VFW and you hear their same kinds of concerns about facts.

Many of them from my district came, and they wanted to know why there was not the kind of correct information that was getting out on the floor of the House of Representatives, why we weren't talking about the truth as it relates to, not just our veterans, but the current situation in the world. They were extremely concerned that so many of our friends on the other side of the aisle were distorting the truth, were not bringing real information to the American people, and were causing great challenges for all of us to try to do the right thing as it relates to our Nation and to our members of the military right now who are defending liberty around the globe, and to assist veterans in their time of need. And so I shared my concern with them about the information that was being brought forth, especially about the situation in Iraq.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, we have heard what the strategy of the Democrats is as it relates to Iraq. They have preemptively surrendered. One of their Members has defined what has been described as a slow-bleed policy. It kind of gives you chills when you think about it, Mr. Speaker, a slow-bleed policy. That individual was interviewed 2 or 3 weeks ago, and during that period of time when asked how is he going to institute this, how is he going to institute this slow-bleed policy on the military as a Member of the House of Representatives, an influential Member of the House, a member of the majority party, a member who has an opportunity to do great things, and what he has said is, "They won't be able to continue. They won't be able to do the deployment. They won't have the equipment."

Mr. Speaker, that is chilling. That is chilling.

It is made all the more disgusting because of the comments of our own Speaker who said that funds would never be cut off from our troops in harm's way. And here the individual who is charged with developing the strategy for the majority party in the House of Representatives on Iraq says, "They won't be able to continue. They won't be able to do the deployment. They won't have the equipment."

Mr. Speaker, I don't know about you, but I get e-mails and communications sent to me from constituents who are serving in Iraq. I know men and women

who are serving in Iraq who are doing their duty. To have a Member of the House of Representatives in a remarkably influential role say he is going to do all he can to limit the equipment that will protect our men and women in harm's way in Iraq and around the world is deplorable. It is deplorable.

Mr. Speaker, that is a fact. Not an opinion, not my opinion. That is a fact. That is what he said. That is what he plans on doing. That is what he said he will work to convince his party to do.

About that same time, our Speaker was quoted as making the following claim, "Democrats have proposed a different course of action over and over again, and we have suggested a different plan." That is the claim. That is the facts of the statement.

The truth, according to United States Senator JOE LIEBERMAN who has been a stalwart in recognizing the danger that the world finds itself in and recognizing the importance of supporting our troops who are in harm's way, the truth, as he states it, is, "Any alternatives that I have heard ultimately don't work. They are all about failing. They are all about withdrawing. And I think allowing Iraq to collapse would be a disaster for the Iraqis, for the Middle East, and for us."

□ 1900

Mr. Speaker, I find the double talk that is coming out of the majority party's mouth at this time as it relates to protecting our troops and fighting for freedom and liberty to be not only disingenuous, I find it to be a disservice to the American people, because when we are not talking about facts, it is impossible to reach the right conclusion.

All of us come to this body with various experiences, different backgrounds, different professions, different work experience. Mine is as a physician. I spent over 20 years, nearly 25 years practicing medicine. And I knew that when I took care of patients, that if I didn't do my level best to make certain that I had made the right diagnosis, that I had dealt with truthful items to get to the right diagnosis, I couldn't institute the right treatment.

And so I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues that unless we recognize truthful statements, unless we recognize the facts that are presented to us, that we will not make the right diagnosis. And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the other side, the majority party has failed to make the correct diagnosis, so it will be difficult for them to institute the right treatment.

Now, I won't go so far as to say, although I might be legitimate in doing so, that occasionally, when physicians make the wrong diagnosis, they are charged with malpractice. But I would ask my friends on the other side of the aisle to appreciate and recognize that truth will get you to the right diagnosis, which will allow all of us to work together to identify what the right treatment ought to be.

And that is in the case with this reprehensible, "slow bleed" policy that

has been put forward by the majority party, as much it is with the rest of the policies that we will address, some of which we will address tonight.

I want to just highlight a couple other matters as it relates to this "slow bleed" policy. And Mr. Speaker, as you know what that has been defined as is cutting off the funding or decreasing the funding, not for the troops specifically but for the equipment, for the logistics, for the support staff that is required, all of the things that make it so our men and women can be secure in the knowledge that they are able to have all the equipment and the personnel available to protect themselves and to carry out their mission.

So, once again, the quote from our Speaker, another quote from our Speaker about, almost now 2 months ago, from January 19, 2007. The quote was, "Democrats will never cut off funding for our troops when they are in harm's way."

The reality is, and it goes into a broken promise that I believe, we believe, the other side is getting very adept at. They are continuing to break promises that they make with the American people over and over again. This one, the promise was, we will never cut off funding for the troops.

The reality, according to Mr. JOHN CONYERS, Representative JOHN CONYERS, "The founders of our country gave our Congress the power of the purse because they envisioned a scenario exactly like we find ourselves in today. Not only is it in our power, it is our obligation. It is our obligation to stop President Bush."

Another quote from Representative MAXINE WATERS, Representative from California, made just a couple of weeks ago, "I will not vote for one dime. I will not vote for one dime."

So, Mr. Speaker, we see the promises that are being made, that are being talked about to the American people, but the truth of the matter is that the majority party is continuing to break promises, and I find that very distressing. I also find that of great concern to being able, once again, to reach the right diagnosis of the challenges that we have before us and then moving forward with the correct treatment.

I want to talk for a little bit, now, Mr. Speaker, about another item that has, another issue that has not had a whole lot of light from the other side of the aisle on it, and that is our economy and the remarkable economic growth that this Nation has seen over the last three to 4 years.

If you look at truth, and you look at facts, one would have to admit that this has been a remarkably robust economy. We have now seen nearly 3½ years of solid, consistent economic expansion which followed the downturn, the economic downturn and the recession of 2001.

The measure of economic expansion can be measured by all sorts of dif-

ferent parameters, and we are going to look at a couple of them this evening. Measure of economic expansion can be measured by real GDP growth, gross domestic product growth. And that has averaged a robust 3.6 percent since the enactment of what, Mr. Speaker? Tax reductions in 2003. The tax relief measures of 2003 have resulted in, I believe, we believe, a remarkably robust economy.

And so as we move through these facts tonight, as we move through these measures, it is important to appreciate, well, how did that all come about? Why did that happen? It didn't just happen willy nilly. And so what we have seen over the last 3½ years is a remarkably robust growth in the gross domestic product; 3.6 percent, as I mentioned, over that period of time. Mr. Speaker, that is faster than the averages of the 1970, which was 3.4 percent, the 1980s, which was 3.1 percent, and I know this will come as a shock to some folks, Mr. Speaker, but those glory days of the 1990s, when we all thought that the economy was booming as rapidly as it could and as good as it could; in fact, that growth during the 1990s was 3.3 percent, again, compared to 3.6 percent since the tax reductions, appropriate tax reductions in 2003.

What we have on this chart, Mr. Speaker, is the unemployment rate, and it is another kind of gauge of how the economy is doing. How many jobs is our economy creating? And that is the good news, Mr. Speaker, that since June of 2003, 7.4 million new jobs; 7.4 million new jobs, Mr. Speaker, which is a remarkable number, an average of 169,000 new jobs each and every month.

Now, you would say, well, that had just been going on just like that before the reductions in the tax rates in 2003. But this poster, Mr. Speaker, speaks to that. What this poster shows is the level of unemployment, the percent level of unemployment in our Nation and plots it over a period of time.

Here on the far left portion of the graph, we have 2001, and on the far right portion, we have 2007. So over the past 7 years, 6 to 7 years, what we see is this red line that demonstrates the level of unemployment. And we see it climbing from a rate of mid 4 percent until 2003, at this point where it reached its apex, its highest amount of about 6.3 percent. And at that point, something happened.

Something happened, Mr. Speaker. And what happened was that this administration recognized and this Congress recognized that the economy needed stimulating, needed some encouragement, needed some investment. And our good friends on the other side of the aisle oftentimes say, well, when the economy needs more money what we need to do is to get more taxes from the American people. We need to take more money from them so that government has the amount of money that it needs to be able to do whatever they would like to do with revenue that comes into the Federal Government.

But what we understand, and what fiscal conservatives understand and what true historians understand is that, when you cut taxes, when you decrease taxes on the American people, revenue goes up, the economy booms, and jobs are created. And that is what happened in 2003, Mr. Speaker. And you see, since then, a steady decline in the unemployment rate. Why? Because the American people had more money in their back pocket, because American people know best how to spend their money, not government. It is not the government's money. It is the American people's money. And when they have that money and can make those decisions, those personal financial decisions, then our Nation is helped in ways that are incalculable. Incalculable. And what happens is that the economy grows, the economy booms, and more jobs are created.

What about household net worth? We have heard, well, it is not getting down to real people. It is not getting down to those who own homes. In fact, Mr. Speaker, there are more individuals, more people, more percent and more numbers of Americans owning homes now than ever before in the history of our Nation. Mr. Speaker, that is a good thing. That is a good thing.

I know there is a lot of doom and gloom out there, and a lot of people in this town don't want the American people to know that there are some good things that are happening in our Nation. I, frankly, get tired of all the naysayers. I know that people in my district do as well, because they know what is happening on the ground and what is happening out there across America is that more Americans own their home now than ever before in the history of our Nation.

And that is not just absolute numbers. That is a percent. Nearly 70 percent of the American people own their home. That is a record. That is a record, Mr. Speaker.

And when you look at household net worth, household net worth, the value of homes for the American people has reached an all-time historic high, and in the last year, it increased by 7 percent. We see the unemployment rate down to 4.6 percent in January of this year.

We talked about some averages for economic growth over the last couple of decades, comparing now, where we are right now, to where we have been over the last couple of decades.

What about unemployment? Well, the unemployment rate that we have right now, at 4.6 percent, is lower than the average for the 1960s, 1970s, 1980s, and yes, Mr. Speaker, the 1990s, too. Isn't that something? That is wonderful news. That is great news. And I would suggest to my colleagues in the House that it would be important to relay that news to your constituents. That is a good thing.

The average rate in the 1960s of unemployment was 4.8 percent. Right now, 4.6 percent. The average for the

1970s, difficult time, 6.2 percent. Right now, Mr. Speaker, 4.6 percent. The average through the 1970s, 7.3. Right now, Mr. Speaker, 4.6 percent. And you remember the 1990s? Again, that wonderful time, those halcyon days of the 1990s, when our economy was booming and everybody was doing just grand?

Well, Mr. Speaker, the average unemployment rate in the 1990s was 5.8 percent. Today, 4.6 percent. Mr. Speaker, that is a fact.

And remember, Mr. Speaker, people are entitled, as Senator Moynihan used to say, they are entitled to their opinion, but they are not entitled to their own facts.

And then we hear, well, there are jobs, yes, but they are not good jobs. They are not real jobs. They aren't jobs that have seen any real economic growth. Well, let's look at some facts there, too, Mr. Speaker.

Productivity growth, which is a fundamental driver of the potential long-term economic growth, what kind of productivity, what kind of output our economy is producing, grew at a rate of 2.1 percent in 2006. The average growth between 1993 and 2000, remember those halcyon days, Mr. Speaker, the average growth during that period of time in productivity was 1.8 percent.

□ 1915

The average growth now, productivity growth: 2.1 percent.

So, Mr. Speaker, these are good days from an economic standpoint.

And then wage growth, we hear from some of our friends on the other side of the aisle, well, they just aren't good jobs. Real wage growth isn't happening. But wage growth plus benefits growth, total compensation, which had lagged behind productivity growth earlier in this recovery, surged in the last year, in 2006. It was up 6.3 percent, 6.3 percent on an analyzed rate in the fourth quarter of 2006.

Mr. Speaker, that is good news. That is good news. I would once again urge my friends on the other side of the aisle to convey that good news to their constituents. And then I would urge them to ask why is that happening, why have we seen this kind of good news.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is because of the appropriate tax reductions that this Congress, this administration passed on to the American people in 2003.

We have many folks who will say, well, when you cut taxes, what happens is that the government doesn't have enough money to be able to do what it needs to do. And that sounds plausible, I guess. But when you look at what really happens, when you look at what happens historically and you look at what has happened with this tax reduction in 2003, what we have seen is a significant increase in revenue coming into the Federal Government. And it ought not be a surprise, Mr. Speaker, because in the two major tax reductions that have occurred in this Nation

over the last 45 years, the tax reductions of President Reagan's administration and, yes, Mr. Speaker, the tax reductions of President Kennedy's administration, both of those tax reductions saw a significant increase in the amount of revenue that comes into the Federal Government. And why is that? It seems kind of counterintuitive. Why is that?

Well, again, when you allow the American people to make decisions about their own money and not have the government making decisions about that money, they decide for themselves when to save or to spend or invest that money, and what that does is stimulate the economy in ways that the government never, never can stimulate.

And consequently what you see, Mr. Speaker, is this kind of graph: here we have the capital gains tax revenues. These are revenues from taxes on the gains that are seen across all types of investments. And what we have is the amount of money from that capital gains that came into the Federal Government in the years 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006 on the same track as heading for 2007. And the yellow line on the bottom here, Mr. Speaker, is the projection that the CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, made prior to the tax reductions, appropriate tax reductions. So we see a gradual, steady increase in the amount of money coming into the Federal Government based upon capital gains tax revenue. The same graph would hold for dividend taxation revenue.

And what we see actually happened when the tax reductions were instituted is the blue line, and it tracked a little bit above it for the first year. But what we always see, when you keep tax reductions in place, is more economic development, more job growth, more gross domestic product growth, more revitalization of the economy; and so what happens is that annual revenues coming into the Federal Government actually increase, and they increase by a huge amount. Increase by a huge amount.

The tax relief has resulted in significant economic growth that has resulted in significantly higher tax revenue. After the declines from 2000 to 2003, revenue surged in 2004, 2005, and 2006. In 2005 the revenues grew by 14.6 percent. In 2006 they were up by 11.8 percent.

This next statement, Mr. Speaker, is important because it speaks to the permanence and the penetration of the result of these tax reductions and how they affect the economy and how they affect our Nation. Those two revenue increases, 14.6 percent in 2005 and 11.8 percent in 2006, that was the first time since the mid-1980s, and you will recall that that was the last time we had significant tax reductions, the first time since the mid-1980s that our Nation has generated double-digit revenue growth in consecutive years. Remarkable, Mr. Speaker. It really is.

And I would think that any individual charged with representing this Nation and charged with having some input into how to keep this economy moving and how to generate more growth in this economy would want to know why, why did that happen? What happened in 2003 to turn that around?

And it is still continuing. Revenues continue to surge in fiscal year 2007. Through the first 4 months of the year, revenues are up by 9.8 percent, with 12.6 percent for individual receipts and 22.1 percent for corporate receipts.

Mr. Speaker, these are incredible numbers, truly incredible numbers. So one would think that Members of the House of Representatives, Members of the Senate, who are charged with formulating national policy that by any estimation anybody would look at these numbers and say, yes, that kind of looks pretty good, maybe we ought to continue that. And if you are charged with developing policy, Federal policy, national policy that results in these kinds of good numbers, you would think that they would want to know why, how did that happen.

How did that happen? Well, there are some other charts that I would like to share with you that will demonstrate how that happened and the effect of it.

I think it is always helpful, Mr. Speaker, to compare what happened before the tax reductions and what has happened since because unless you can point to a date on the calendar when something concrete changed and identify the occurrences in this Nation from an economic standpoint before that date and after that date, it becomes difficult to answer that question why, why did these seemingly good things happen?

So this poster here demonstrates business investment before and after the tax relief of 2003. And this is remarkably telling. As you see, the middle line here is the percent of business investment, either increased investment or decreased investment. And you could say, Mr. Speaker, that through 2001 and 2002 and the first quarter of 2003, virtually all of those quarters had decreased business growth or investment. In fact, the average was a decrease of 5.6 percent. And that is a decrease from year to year to year. So, in fact, the cumulative amount of decreased investment is huge.

And then something happened here. Mr. Speaker, on this vertical line, something happened. And it answers the question why, why did we see these remarkable improvements? And it was the appropriate tax reductions of 2003. And these are undeniable numbers. This is the business investment after the tax reductions of 2003, and they have averaged since that time 7.29 percent every quarter. So you see it over and over and over and over again. In fact, we have had 15 straight quarters of economic business investment increase. And that is not because the business of America says it is not a good idea to invest, it is not a good

idea to grow. That is because they say it is a great idea. And the policies that have been put in place at the Federal Government level will result in their opportunity to succeed, their opportunity for their employees to succeed, the opportunity for employees to then take that success from the company and from the employee and go buy homes and go buy cars and go buy all sorts of items that are needed by each and every American. And what happens then is that it just becomes a wonderful self-perpetuating cycle.

But, Mr. Speaker, the reason that it is important to look at this and the reason that I am talking about this tonight and that we on our side of the aisle are trying to bring truth and light to this issue is because there is a plan on the other side of the aisle to do away with the tax reductions that have resulted in all this wonderful, wonderful economic news. And that is just baffling to me when I think about again the challenge, the charge that each of us in this House has, which is to, I believe, develop policies that will work to the benefit of the vast majority and as many Americans as possible.

And these types of numbers here, these facts, Mr. Speaker, not opinions, but facts, demonstrate that that is exactly and precisely what the tax reductions have done from 2003. And they have done so by decreasing also the budget deficit. And, again, if the economy is booming to a greater degree, if it is more successful, more people working, more people investing, more people participating in the American Dream, that is a good thing. And what happens is that more revenue comes into the Federal Government, and what happens, Mr. Speaker, to the budget deficit? It decreases. It goes down. In fact, if we allow the tax reductions to remain in place, which is what we absolutely ought to do, and some of our friends on the other side of the aisle, some of our friends in the majority party have already said they don't believe any of those tax reductions ought to remain in place, that every American ought to have a tax increase, but if we allow them to stay in place, what this chart demonstrates, Mr. Speaker, is that the budget will balance of its own accord because of the policies already in place within a 4-year period of time. Within a 4-year period of time.

Now, our friends on the other side of the aisle, they will come up to the well of the House and they will say, sure we have got to balance the budget, but we have got to raise taxes to do it.

Mr. Speaker, it just isn't so. It just isn't so. So I would encourage all Members of the House to look at these numbers, to appreciate the trend that has occurred, the facts of the economic numbers that we have available to us in this Nation, and to appreciate that there is a reason, there is a reason that more people are working now. There is a reason that more people are owning their own home. There is a reason that more individuals are able to invest in

this economy. There is a reason that there is more money coming into the Federal Government. And that reason is we are allowing more Americans to keep more of their hard-earned money.

Oftentimes I hear in committee meetings many Members of Congress who will talk about the government's money as if it is the government's, as if it is ours in Congress, that we have ownership of this money and that we ought to be able to just spend it as we please without absolute priorities.

We heard our good friends earlier this evening talk about PAYGO, pay-as-you-go, making certain that new programs that come before the Congress, that any costs for those new programs will be offset by decreasing the expenditures for another program. But what they don't tell you, Mr. Speaker, is that in that small print of the rules that they have passed, it doesn't apply to the vast majority of the budget. It doesn't apply. And, in fact, what the Rules Committee upstairs does over and over and over again is to say we are going to bring this bill to the floor and we are going to adopt this program and we will adopt it and not require it to comply with the PAYGO rules that this House has supposedly adopted.

That is what happened in the very first 100 hours, Mr. Speaker, the vaunted 100 hours, that period of time when the new majority was taking this Nation in what they called a "new direction." Well, they were. And the direction they were taking them was into the red, further into the red, by spending more money without any off-sets.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that is what the American people voted for in November of 2006. I just don't believe that. And when I go home, that is what people tell me at home. They don't believe that the Federal Government ought to be spending more money. They think that we ought to be decreasing the expenditures, not increasing them.

So the challenge from an economic standpoint is truly the size of the Federal budget and the lack of ability of this Congress, this new majority Congress, to prioritize where it wants to spend the hard-earned taxpayer money.

□ 1930

Again, Mr. Speaker, it is not the government's money. It is not the government's money. It is the American people's money, and they work hard, hard, for that money, and we ought to be very diligent about how we address spending their hard-earned money.

I believe that we ought to allow them to keep a whole lot more of their hard-earned money. I believe, if you look objectively at the facts of our economy right now, we are moving along pretty well. But there is caution on the horizon.

We are moving down a highway, and we are ticking along pretty well, our speed is pretty much at the speed limit, but the signs are flashing. They

are flashing, and they are saying, caution ahead, caution ahead, because, in our Federal budget, there is automatic spending that is occurring, and it is occurring primarily in three programs: Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, three wonderfully successful programs providing great comfort and assurance to the individuals who receive the benefits from those programs.

Each of those programs have been promises made to the American people, and those programs ought to continue for the individuals who are eligible for those programs currently in the manner in which they were instituted. But if we continue them in that manner for every American who reaches that wonderful age of 62 or 65 and becomes eligible for them, then this is what happens, Mr. Speaker.

This chart demonstrates the entitlement programs, and I don't like that word "entitlement," I like the word "automatic," because it is automatic spending. It just keeps on going. These programs have a formula built into them that generates increased money going into those programs year after year after year because there are more individuals who become eligible for them, because of the demographics of our society. But we are an aging society. There are more individuals who are becoming eligible for these programs, and consequently, it takes more money.

This poster demonstrates the percentage of the Federal budget that is generated in tax revenue, and this line here is the revenue of the Federal budget. So we average somewhere a little below 20 percent of the gross domestic product coming in as tax revenue. If we continue that right along, that is, if we don't raise taxes on the American people, which is what we are committed to doing, that is, not raising taxes, this is about the level of revenue that we will have as a nation.

Down below are the fiscal years starting with 2007, this year, and moving forward all the way to 2050. People say well, that is a long way away, and they are absolutely right. But if no changes are made in these three programs, Medicare being the blue, Medicaid being the yellow and Social Security being the green, this chart demonstrates that those three programs, those three automatic spending programs, will consume the entire Federal budget, the entire Federal budget by the year 2045 or 2046.

That seems like a long way away, Mr. Speaker, but do you know what? That is under 40 years from now. Under 40 years ago was the late sixties, and I remember the late sixties very well. Many of us will remember when the United States landed on the moon. That is about 40 years ago, 38 years ago. Many individuals, most individuals who were alive at the time will certainly remember when President Kennedy was assassinated. On the one hand, it seems a long time ago. On the other hand, it doesn't seem like very

long at all. It doesn't seem like very long at all. So this is not a long way away.

What this is screaming at us, what this is shouting at us, what this is saying to us as we travel down that road and those caution lights are flashing, is that we as a United States Congress, in order to be wise and prudent and spend taxpayer money appropriately, these programs need to be reformed. We need to keep the solemn promise that we have with the American people who are in these programs currently, and we need to make certain that we move forward aggressively and actively with programs that will make it so these are financially sound programs.

Now, there are a couple ways you can go. There are a couple directions you can head when you reform programs like this. The real question that becomes asked when you reform these kinds of programs is this question, Mr. Speaker. It is the question that is really being shouted right now in Washington. That is the question, who decides? Who decides?

We all come to Washington as Members of Congress with different experiences, as I mentioned. We come to Washington with different political stripes. We come to Washington with different political philosophies. We come to Washington with various degrees of understanding or appreciation for our Nation's history and how we became great.

Right now, we are at a crossroads, Mr. Speaker. We are at a crossroads for our financial programs. We are at a crossroads for so many of our social programs. We are at a crossroads for, I believe, our Nation when it relates to freedom and liberty. And the question being asked is, who decides?

Are we going to, with our tax policy, allow the Federal Government to make more and more decisions as it relates to how to spend the hard earned taxpayers' money? Are we going to allow the Federal Government to be the ones that prioritize how the American pocketbook ought to be spent? Are we going to allow the Federal Government to increase its involvement in American lives?

Our friends in the majority party talk about new direction. Mr. Speaker, that is the new direction that I see. When they talk about it, bill after bill and policy after policy, if you look at each and every one, whatever the policy is, the question that they are answering is, who decides?

Their answer to that question, more often than not, Mr. Speaker, is that the Federal Government ought to be deciding, not the States, not the local communities and not the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to believe firmly in the rectitude of decisions made by the American people. I believe strongly that decisions are best when left to the American people, about almost anything. I believe that the American people know best how to spend their hardearned money.

That is why I believe that it is incumbent upon all of us to ask those questions, why is the economy doing as well as it is right now, appreciating the truth in the facts that have been presented this evening that demonstrate that the reason that the economy is doing so well right now is because Americans have more of their hardearned money in their back pocket so that they can decide when they spend or they save or invest their money. What that results in is the ability and the opportunity for them to make those personal decisions; not the Federal Government.

So, Mr. Speaker, when you see people coming down to the floor of the House and they are asking questions about or asking their colleagues to support this program or that program or this policy or that policy, I would ask you to think about this question: Well, who is deciding? Who are they asking to make decisions in this bill? And more often than not, Mr. Speaker, I think you will appreciate that this new majority, the Democrat majority that is currently controlling this House of Representatives, is answering that question with the Federal Government. The Federal Government is deciding.

I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, that I am a physician. In my previous life, I was a doctor. I practiced medicine outside of Atlanta for nearly 25 years. I have great concerns about the direction of health care in our Nation.

We are at one of those crossroads, and this is the question that this Congress will have to answer as it relates to health care: Who decides? Who is going to be allowed to make personal health care decisions? Is it going to be patients and doctors, is it going to be families and their children, along with the guidance of a medical professional, or is it going to be the Federal Government? Is it going to be individuals in buildings around this Capitol and around this Nation who may or may not have any medical training or any medical experience at all that will be making decisions, personal health care decisions, for people?

I don't think that is the direction in which we ought to go, Mr. Speaker, and I don't think that is what the American people believe we ought to do as it relates to health care, and I certainly don't believe that that is the new direction that the American people thought they were going to get when they went to the polls last November.

You say, well, what kind of program could that be? Well, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of proposals that have been put forward by members of the majority party, and not just freshman members, not just members who don't have any input, real input, into the nuts and bolts of health care policy that is coming forward. In fact, what we have are the chairs of the committees of jurisdiction, the chair of the House Ways and Means Committee that has jurisdiction over health care

and the chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee that has jurisdiction over health care in this Nation.

Those individuals, certainly the latter, has said that what he believes we ought to move toward in terms of health care in this Nation is what he describes as Medicare for all. Medicare for all.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to tell you that all patients have to do around this Nation, all citizens have to do around this Nation, is the next time they talk to their doctor, ask their doctor, do you believe that our health care system would be better if it were to look like Medicare? Do you believe that my personal insurance would be better if it were like Medicare? Do you believe that allowing the Federal Government to make health care decisions like they do in Medicare for our entire Nation is the right way to go?

I don't believe that is the case, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe that is what the American people want, and I know, I know that when patients ask their doctors around this Nation, that is not what they will want.

Why? Why wouldn't we want Medicare for all? Let me give you an example or two, Mr. Speaker.

We had a huge debate a couple of years ago in this Nation about whether or not Medicare ought to cover prescription medication for Medicare recipients. That debate went on for a few years. It was a proposal by this administration, passed by this Congress in 2003, and we have seen that program instituted over the past 14 months, 15 months, and it is a relatively successful program.

But I don't want to talk about the merits of the program, because that is a different debate. I want to talk, Mr. Speaker, about a program that takes 40 years to decide that it needs to cover prescription medication for seniors in this Nation. That is Medicare. It is a government program that cannot, it is impossible for it to be responsive to people. It is impossible for it to incorporate the kind of new inventions and wonderful treatment options that are available to the American people in a private system. It is impossible for them to be able to incorporate those treatment changes to benefit patients.

Why is it impossible? Because it is a massive government bureaucracy, and a massive government bureaucracy cannot be by its very definition nimble and flexible and responsive to the American people. And that is the answer to this question, who decides? Who decides?

This new majority thinks that the Federal Government ought to be deciding personal health care decisions for people. I, and most of my colleagues on our side of the aisle, simply believe that ought not be the case; that patients and doctors, that families and children in consultation with their doctor, that those people ought to be the ones that are making those personal health care decisions.

So I urge my colleagues to ask as we go through the next number of months, as we go through the kind of policy suggestions and bills that will come to the floor, to ask this question. I know what my answer is. Who ought to decide in terms of the policies that we brought forward? I know what my answer is. I believe that the American people ought to be the ones deciding.

□ 1945

I believe that the American people ought to be the ones that have an opportunity to say, I think that my hard-earned money ought to be spent in this way. I ought to be allowed to decide when to spend or save or invest my money, not the Federal Government, not the Federal Government. As well intentioned as they are, and individuals who work in the Federal Government by and large are extremely well intentioned, they are encumbered by the very apparatus that is in place because of the size and massive nature of our Federal Government. It is impossible for them to be responsive to the American people. It is impossible for them to be as nimble as they ought to be, to be as flexible as they ought to be.

Health care is one example where science is exploding, and all sorts of wonderful opportunities are available for the treatment of disease. But should we in this House of Representatives be the ones deciding what kind of health care treatment ought to be given in a very particular instance? I would say no. Those decisions ought to be the decisions of people, individuals with their doctor and their family.

So I urge my colleagues as we look at the issues that come before us over the next number of months to ask this question: Who decides? Who ought to decide? I think if they answer honestly, they will come down on the side that I have come down on, and that is on the side of the American people.

I would encourage my colleagues when they go home this weekend when they talk to their constituents to ask their constituents, who do you think ought to decide how to spend your money? Should you, should the American people decide that, or should the Federal Government? Should the American people be able to decide what kind of health care treatment they ought to receive, or should the Federal Government? Should the American people be able to decide what kind of education system they want for their children, where they want their child educated, what kind of curriculum they want for their children in their community, or should that decision be made by the Federal Government?

Huge questions, Mr. Speaker. We are at a crossroads. We are at a crossroads in this Nation on so many areas. Our time right now is to govern responsibly. It is our time to make certain that we listen to our constituents. It is our time to do our due diligence to make certain that we appreciate how

we became this wonderful and glorious and grand and great Nation. It is our responsibility in the United States Congress to listen to the truth, to appreciate how we got to where we are right now and to incorporate the structure that allowed us to become this great and wonderful and glorious Nation, to be the Nation that truly is the beacon to all who love freedom and love liberty around this world. How did we become that Nation, and to incorporate the reasons, the rationale and the policies that brought us to that point into the policies that we promote to move our Nation forward.

I am confident that if we do that, we will answer the question of who decides, with the American people being first and foremost. I am confident if we do that as a Congress, we will make the right conclusions. I am confident if we do that as Congress, we will make the right diagnosis for this Nation, and we will develop the right treatment plan as we go forward.

I want to thank once again the leadership for allowing me the opportunity to come and speak to the House this evening and bring some truth and light to some issues that are oftentimes very complex, but oftentimes very simple because we ask simple questions. We ask simple questions: Who should decide? Should it be the American people or the Federal Government? Mr. Speaker, I vote for the American people.

PEAK OIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARCURI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I believe this is the 24th time since the 14th day of last March that I have come to this floor to talk about a subject which is growing in importance. That subject is energy.

I had the privilege of leading a codel to China. We left just after Christmas and we spent New Year's in Shanghai. There were nine of us who went there, and the primary purpose of that congressional delegation was to talk to the Chinese primarily about energy.

I was both surprised, shocked, and really pleasantly surprised that they began their conversation about energy by talking about post oil. This just wasn't the energy people in China, it was high officials in other parts of the government. Everywhere we went and spoke with them, they talked about post-oil, a recognition that oil cannot be forever, and they talked about a five-point program.

The first point of this program was conservation, a recognition that the world has no surplus energy to invest in developing alternatives. If there was any surplus energy, we wouldn't be paying \$60 a barrel for oil.

Conservation not only frees up oil, but it buys some time because if we in

fact are producing oil at the rate at which it is consumed and we cannot easily increase that production, then we have not only run out of surplus energy, we have also run out of time. So an aggressive conservation program will buy some time and free up some energy that we can invest in alternatives.

So the first part of their five-point plan was conservation. The second and third points was diversify, get energy from as many other nonfossil fuel sources as you can, and get as much of it as you can from your own country. From a national security perspective, that makes good sense.

The fourth point in their five-point program, and again, it wasn't just the energy people in China talking about this, it was leaders in government in several other parts of the government, the fourth part of their five-point plan was be kind to the environment. You think, gee, that is strange they would say that since they are the world's biggest polluter. They are the world's biggest country. Their economy grew at 11.4 percent for the last quarter. And they know they are a big polluter. They are apologetic. They have 1.3 billion people, and they don't know how to use energy wisely, and they are asking for cooperation so they might use their energy as efficiently as we use ours.

The fifth point was that we need international cooperation because this planet is a little spaceship, not all that big. It once seemed absolutely enormous when we sailed the ocean in sailing ships, but now with airplanes it seems much smaller. We are here together, so we have a global responsibility.

I thought of this attitude on the part of the Chinese when I read an article that appeared in the New York Times on page 1 on March 5. It says, "Oil innovations pump new life into old fields."

Bakersfield, California. That is out in the desert. I used to teach medical school out there and drove through Bakersfield coming east. This states the Kern River oil field, discovered in 1899, revived when Chevron engineers here started injecting high-pressure steam to pump out more oil. The field, whose production had slumped to 10,000 barrels a day in the 1960s now has a daily output of 85,000 barrels. In Indonesia, Chevron has applied the same technology to the giant Duri oil field discovered in 1941, increasing production there to more than 200,000 barrels a day, up from 65,000 barrels a day in the mid-1980s. And in Texas, ExxonMobil, the world's largest oil company, expects to double the amount of oil it extracts in its Means field which dates back to the 1930s. Exxon, like Chevron, will use three-dimensional imaging of the underground field and the injection of gas, in this case carbon dioxide, to flush out the oil.

I might pause to interject here that this is a very appropriate use of carbon

dioxide. It is a greenhouse gas. Its concentration in the atmosphere has about doubled in the last couple hundred years, and most of the world's scientists who study weather believe that the Earth's temperature is increasing and that the greenhouse gases, chief among them carbon dioxide, are responsible. So sequestering the carbon dioxide and pumping it down into these wells to force the oil out is a doubly good thing. It keeps it from going into the atmosphere, and it gets some additional oil.

This article continues, within the last decade, technology advances have made it possible to unlock more oil from old fields, and at the same time higher oil prices have made it economical for companies to go after reserves that are harder to reach. With plenty of oil still left in familiar locations, forecasts that the world's reserves are drying out have given way to predictions that more oil will be found than ever before.

Well, I have a chart here which looks at the oil discoveries back through the last number of years, last 70 years, and we see here in the bar graph the discoveries of oil and we see there were some big discoveries in the 1940s and 1950s and 1970s and down in the 1980s. And ever since that time, it has been down, down, down. That is in spite of ever-better technology for discovering oil.

They mention the 3-D seismic computer modeling they are using. We now have a pretty good idea of the Earth's geology, and so we know where we might find gas and oil. Some very unique geological conditions are necessary in order to have gas and oil. We don't really know how the oil and gas got there, but there are some reasonable conjectures, and if you understand these conjectures and if they are correct, it gives you some clue as to how much more gas and oil we are likely to find.

The most popular theory goes that a long time ago when the Earth was more uniformly warm than today, there did not appear to be the torrid equator or the frigid poles, and because there were subtropical seas at the North Slope and in ANWR and in Prudhoe Bay, and those subtropical seas had a seasonal growth and then death of algae-like organisms and maybe some small, animal organisms with them like the algae that grows on your pond today. I don't know that they had winters, but they had seasonal growth, and each season it would mature and die and then sink to the bottom, and Earth runoff would mix in and overlay it, and then the next year another layer of the organic material was deposited. This continued until there was big buildup, a lot like at the bottom of a lake.

Then the theory says that the tectonic plates of the Earth moved and surface seas with all of the organic material mixed with the inorganic, rock and sand, were now submerged down under considerable pressure and near

enough to the molten core of the Earth there was just the right combination of pressure and temperature. And with time, this organic material was converted into what we know as gas and oil.

Now the products were some very short-chain products such as gases, methane, the shortest of the chains; and then very long chain ones which end up as Vaseline or waxes or something like that. If there was not a rock dome over this, kind of an umbrella of rock, then the gases would have escaped through the years and what would be left was some tarry stuff that you couldn't pump because you would have to heat it up. That is known as heavy oil where it exists today. You have to heat it up or mix it with volatiles to get it moving.

This dome keeps the gas from escaping. This was the explanation why for many oil wells when you finally pump down into the oil, it is not a pocket of oil that you are sucking out like a soda through a straw. It is all mixed with sand and rock, fractured rock and so forth, but it will flow. For wells that were gushers, this gas pressure that accumulated under the rock dome was now pushing down on this oil, and it pushed it up the well pipe. So we had these gushers.

□ 2000

Well, this may not have been the way that oil and gas was produced, but it certainly sounds logical because that is where we find it, where we have these rock domes and so forth. What that means is, of course, that with these current techniques that we have of mapping the world, we can find those areas which have rock domes, which were likely to and with the location relative to the edges of the tectonic place, we can now identify where it is probable that you might find gas and oil production. And with ever-increased capabilities, computer modeling and 3-D seismic, we have found less and less oil through the years.

Now, this chart has another curve on it, and that is the consumption curve. Interesting curve. You will notice for a long time we were finding enormously more oil than we were using, because we were using this much, but we had found that much. But from about 1980 on, increasingly we have found less and less oil and used more and more oil.

I would like you to note the interesting change in the curve here in the 1970s. There was a stunning statistic up until the seventies, the Carter years, with this rate of increase and use. Every decade the world was using as much oil as it had used in all of previous history. Now that is a stunning statistic. What that means is that when you have used half the world's oil, there would then be 10 years left at current use rates. Well, we had a big shock in the 1970s at the Arab oil embargo, and we learned how to be much more efficient. For, what, 10 years or so here, there was essentially no increase in oil, and now it is slowly going

up again as the world's economies grow. In China, bicycles are banned on some of their streets. I was late getting to one of the appointments there because of traffic jams in Beijing. I was, a couple of years ago, in Moscow, and traffic jams in Moscow. I was there in 1973, and the streets were essentially deserted. The only cars I saw there were a few government cars. So all over the world there is a surge in interest in automobiles, and they are now being bought by the Indians. And not very long, the Indian middle class will be as big as our whole population. Information technology, which they excel, is increasing this middle class.

Now, this chart looks at what the future may hold. This article that I just read, "Oil Innovations Pump New Life Into Old Wells" says that we are going to have more oil than we have ever found. Now, we are not really finding new oil, most of this is oil that is in some of these fields, and these bars will go up higher here because now, with enhanced recovery, we are able to get more oil out. And they are making the projection that we are going to find as much more oil as we have remaining. And one projection is, and I will come to that in a few moments, that we are going to find as much more oil as we have ever found.

The next chart shows an interesting picture. This is the same consumption curve that you saw there with the same perturbations between the seventies and the eighties as a result of the Arab oil embargo.

Now, this chart, which is from our Energy Information Agency, is assuming something that I think is not rational to assume, and that is that we are going to find as much more oil as all of the reserves which we now know to exist.

A couple of congresses ago, I chaired the Energy Subcommittee on Science, and one of the first things I wanted to do was to determine the dimensions of the problem, and so we had oil experts from all over the world come in. How much oil did we find? How much of what we found is still there? And there was surprising unanimity from just under 2,000 giga barrels to just over 2,000 giga barrels. That is their figure here of 2,248,000 billion barrels.

Now, we use giga barrels. They said billion barrels here, that is because it is for an American audience. But if you were in England, a billion is a million million, in this country it is a thousand million. So you may confuse the audience when you are talking about billions. If you use giga, apparently giga is a billion the world around. But what I want to point out in this chart is that even if they are correct, that the main amount, expected amount of oil that we will find, is 3,000 giga barrels, that moves the peak out from the present to only 2016. So even if they are right, and I think the probability that they are right is small, and I will give you several evidences of that as we go along, but even if they are right, even

if we find as much more oil as all the reserves that we now know to exist out there, that will move the peak out only from about now, when most of those who work in this area believe that peaking has occurred or will shortly occur. If we find there is much more as that which remains, and by the way, of this 2,248,000 giga barrels, we have used about half of that, and about half of it remains. Now, with this enhanced oil recovery that this article is talking about from the New York Times, we will get a bit more of that. How much more remains to be seen. But if we find this extra roughly thousand giga barrels, that will only move the peak out to 2016. Now, one of the authorities in this area believes that we will find another thousand giga barrels, and we will be up around 4,000 giga barrels total. If that is true, since this is an exponential curve, and this was only, what, 16 years? The next may be only 12 years. So that moves the peak out only to about 2028. And that assumes that we are going to find as much more oil as all the oil that has ever been found.

The next chart shows an interesting prediction, and the data that was collected following the prediction. This shows the discovery curves. What this does here is to kind of round out those big bars that you saw in the previous one. And here they have done a very interesting thing. They have taken the F-5, F-50 and F-95, which was fractional, and I don't have the chart to how they got there, but I can tell you how they got there. What they did is run a lot of simulations. And they had the number of simulations on the ordinate, and they had the amount of oil that the simulation indicated would be found on the abscissa. So, they put these numbers into their computer simulation, and they got numbers out, and they graft all those numbers. And then they found the mean of those numbers, and they found that 95 percent, which meant that 95 percent of the predictions indicate you would find more oil than that and so forth. And so they assumed that the most likely thing would be the mean. Now, it was a mean of their projections. But somehow that F got translated when it went from USGS to the Energy Information Agency, it got translated to P, which is the probability. Now, if this is really probability, this is a bizarre use of statistics.

So they show here three probabilities. They show the P-95 probability, the P-50 probability and the P-5 probability. Now, if these really are probabilities, there should be another green line coming down this way; because if you are only 50 percent certain, obviously that is a pretty broad funnel you create out there. If you are only 5 percent certain, it is really broad. It is like the path of the hurricane. For the next 24 hours, they know pretty well where it will be, so that is pretty narrow. But as you go out in time, 2, 3 and 4 days, why it gets wider

and wider because you are less and less certain of where it is going. So there should have been another green line down here and another blue line down here because you have a broad uncertainty if you are only 5 percent certain.

But notice what the actual data points have been doing. They have been following, as you might suspect, the 95 percent probability, if in fact it is probability. Obviously 95 percent probable is a lot more probable than 50 percent probable.

In a wide-ranging study published in 2000, a U.S. Geological Survey estimated that ultimately recoverable sources of conventional oil total about 3.3 trillion barrels, that was this little mean number in the previous chart right here, of which a third has already been produced. What has been produced is a half of what we have discovered. They are predicting that we will discover for that mean, as they call it, as much more oil as all of the reserves that we now know to exist.

More recently, Cambridge Energy Research Associates, an energy consultant, estimates the total base of recoverable oil, and here they have 4.8 trillion. The little chart I showed you before had that at just under 4 trillion, you will remember. But notice from the peaking chart that even if that is true, that will push peaking out to only a bit before 2030. That is not all that far into the future.

Then they say there is a minority view held largely by a small band of retired petroleum geologists and some Members of Congress, that would be me, that oil production has peaked, but the theory they say has been fading. Well, they should have told that to T. Boone Pickens, because an Associated Press article, March 1 of this year, just a few days ago, this is from Doha, Qatar, he is over there talking about oil. And by the way, I didn't know until I read this article that he started his professional life as a petroleum geologist. We know him as a very wise investor on Wall Street. Legendary Texas oil man T. Boone Pickens sees today's stubbornly high price as evidence that daily global production capacity is at or very near its peak.

If demand for crude rises beyond the current global output of roughly 85 million barrels a day, Pickens told the Associated Press, prices will rise to compensate, and alternative sources of energy will begin to replace petroleum. If I am right, T. Boone Pickens says, we are already at the peak. If that is true, the price will have to go up.

And then he makes this statement: "I think there are less reserves around the world than are being reported." Well, the two sources I mention are reporting greatly increased reserves. T. Boone Pickens says that he believes that they are over-reporting, said the 78-year-old former—by the way, young people can be very bright, but wisdom comes with age, and so T. Boone Pickens has 78 years of wisdom—who now

heads the Dallas-based Hedge Fund BP Capital. There are no audited reserves in the Mid East. It makes me suspicious, he says. We really don't know how much oil is in the Mideast because they do not open their books for us to see.

Forbes publisher, Steve Forbes, challenged Pickens' assumptions during an exchange during the conference saying political, not technological or geological, road blocks stood in the way of increasing the world's oil production. Now, I know Steve Forbes, and I admire him very much, but I think that he gives far too much credit to the marketplace. Many people believe that the market is both omniscient, that is, all knowledgeable, and omnipotent, all powerful.

If we had unlimited resources, the market might do what Steve Forbes has confidence that it will do. With the right incentives in places, such as Mexico, more oil could be brought to market and prices could drop, Forbes said. Pickens responded by saying that Mexico is a declining producer of oil, as are most other countries, indeed. Thirty-five out of the top 43 oil-producing countries in the world have already reached peak.

□ 2015

Pickens responded by saying that Mexico is a declining producer of oil, as are most other countries, naming the United States, Norway, Britain and soon Russia. By the way, Russia did peak once already, and then they kind of fell apart with the dissolution of the Soviet Union. They are reaching a second peak, which I believe will be less than the first peak.

"The world has been looked at," Pickens told Forbes. "There is still oil to be found, but not in the quantities we have seen in the past. The big fields have been found and the smaller fields, well, there is just not enough of them to replenish the base. Global consumers, led by the United States, have already pumped 1.1 trillion barrels of oil, roughly half of the 2.2 trillion barrels that have been discovered," or what Pickens describes as nearly half of the world's estimate. He thinks we will find a little more, 2.5 trillion barrels of oil. Other experts put reserves at 3 trillion, Energy Information Agency; or 4 trillion barrels of oil, Cambridge Energy Research Associates.

"From now on," Pickens said, "rising demand will be met by higher prices, rather than ever larger crude oil production. Alternative energy sources will begin to take a share of the energy market until the world evolves from a hydrocarbon-based economy to something that is a mix of hydrocarbons and something else. Everything from nuclear, coal, wind, solar, hydrogen and biofuels stands a chance to assuage growing demand for energy."

I would just like to make a comment about hydrogen. All the others are truly energy sources. Nuclear, coal, wind, solar, biofuels are energy

sources. Hydrogen is not an energy source. So why do we list it there? You can't mine hydrogen; you can't pump hydrogen. The only way you can get hydrogen is to make it from something else. Unless you are going to violate the second law of thermodynamics, it will always take more energy to make hydrogen than you will get out of hydrogen.

It is made today largely from natural gas. It can also be made by electromagnetizing water, splitting water into hydrogen and oxygen. Well, if you will always use more energy to make the hydrogen than you get out of the hydrogen, why would we be interested in hydrogen?

Well, for two reasons. One is that when you finally burn it, you get water. Water is the oxide of hydrogen. When you burn hydrogen, you get hydrogen oxide. We commonly call it water. That is pretty nonpolluting.

The second reason we are interested is that it is a great candidate for fuel cells if we ever get economically supportable fuel cells. We have been working on them for a long time, experts tell us, maybe 20 years. We will have economically supportable fuel cells, but that's the reason we talk about hydrogen.

A lot of people believe hydrogen is an energy source. Hydrogen, think of it as a battery, is something that carries energy from one place to another place. You can't put the falling water in your car and run it, nor can you put the electricity, unless you have a lot of batteries in your car to run the car, but you can take the electricity you get from the hydroelectric plant, split water, compress the hydrogen, put the hydrogen in your car. So you are really running your car on the energy from the waterfall.

But secondhand you produce hydrogen with it, and if you have a fuel cell in your car, now you will not only be running your car, polluting, just with water, which is pretty nonpolluting, but you will also get at least twice the efficiency out of that as you get out of the reciprocating engine.

The next chart is a very interesting one that shows us the sources to which one might turn to get energy other than the energy we get from fossil fuels. This chart reminds me very much of a young couple whose grandmother has died and left them a big inheritance, and they now have established a pretty lavish lifestyle. Eighty-five percent of all the money they spent came from their grandmother's inheritance and only 15 percent of the money they spend comes from what they earn.

They look at their grandmother's inheritance and how old they are, and, gee, this money is not going to last until we retire, so obviously we have got to do something, and that something is going to be either make more money or spend less money. That is pretty much exactly where we are relative to energy.

Eighty-five percent, some people will tell you 86 percent, but 85 percent of all the energy that we are expending today comes from natural gas, from petroleum, and from coal; and that leaves only 15 percent of the gas to come from other sources, of energy to come from other sources.

A bit more than half of that 15 is nuclear energy. That is 20 percent of our electricity, and in France, by the way, about 80 or 85 percent of their electricity comes from nuclear; and in our country, about 20 percent, but it is 8 percent of our total energy.

So when you look at the true renewables, only 7 percent now, it is a little different than this today, because this is a 2000 chart, and we have been really ramping up with solar cells, for instance, producing solar electricity. That market has been growing at about 30 percent a year. That is incredible growth.

But this started out as 1 percent of 7 percent, that is .07 percent. Suppose it is four times bigger today, that is .28 percent, less than a third of a percent, big deal. We have got a long way to go.

Thirty-eight percent of this renewable energy comes from wood, but that is not the person heating their house with wood so much as it is the timber industry and the paper industry wisely using what would otherwise be a waste product to produce energy. Waste to energy, 8 percent of this 7 percent.

There is a really state-of-the-art plant up here in Dickerson. They will be happy to have you come visit. It is really a showcase, and they are burning waste to produce electricity.

Now, one word of caution about waste: that huge stream of waste represents a big investment of fossil fuels, and don't count on having that big stream of waste in an energy-deficient world. We will live comfortably, we can live comfortably, but we will be producing far less waste in the future because all of that waste represents the use of fossil fuels.

If T. Boone Pickens is correct, and, by the way, he is not the only one, there are a number of experts out there who believe that we have peaked or are about to peak, there will be less and less of this waste. But at least for a moment it is a great use of this waste material, much better, I think, than putting it in a landfill. Recycle what you can; what you can't recycle, why, burn it to produce energy.

Wind. That is growing; it is really efficient. Our big wind machines today are producing electricity at about 2.5 cents a kilowatt hour. By the way, none of those big ones are made in our country. I hope we can change that, but Norway makes them, for instance.

These are huge machines with blades that turn very slowly. You have to be a really sick bird or bat that flew into those. These aren't the little ones they had first where the blades twirled around quickly and did kill some birds and bats. You may have seen them. They are really quite large, and, I think, quite handsome.

That could and should grow. It is really growing in California. It is a totally renewable resource. By the way, the wind is simply secondhand sun. The wind blows because the sun heats the Earth unequally and so it is differential temperatures on the surface that cause the winds to blow.

Then the big chunk of these renewables are conventional hydroelectric. Now, in our country we have pretty much tapped out on the conventional hydroelectric. We probably dammed every river that should have been dammed and maybe a few that shouldn't have been dammed. They are now building fish ladders, and we are blowing up some of those dams because we think that the environmental pressures are greater than the relatively small amount of electricity we get from some of those.

That probably can't grow much in our country, conventional, but microhydro produces far less environmental impact and some believe might be as big as conventional hydro. This is a little dam and small amounts of electricity, maybe only watts, but 100 watts, 24/7, that will produce a fair amount of light for your reading, for instance.

At this 2000 chart, alcohol fuel represented 1 percent of 7 percent, that is .07 percent. Today it represents more than that. We have a number of ethanol plants; it is growing very rapidly. There is a very interesting speech given by Hyman Rickover to an audience of physicians. The 50th anniversary of that will be in just a few days, few weeks, the 14th day of May. In that article he noted, that speech, really, we used to have a transcript of it, he noted that one day there would be competition between energy and food for our biological crops.

I thought of that when I spent some time on a couple of occasions recently with our dairymen; and what has happened is that with the relatively small amount of ethanol we have made from corn, the supply demand has been so changed that in September of last year corn was \$2.11 a bushel, and in December it was \$4.08 a bushel, nearly double. The price of tortillas in Mexico has gone up, which is hurting poor people there, and our dairymen are going bankrupt because of the high cost of feed. Now, this is a boon to the corn producer, but it is anything but that to the animal feeder, because with the relatively small amount of ethanol that we have made, we have doubled the price of corn.

Well, this pretty much is where we are going to have to find alternative energy sources, and it is quite obvious, if you stop and think about it. You may want to put this off into the future, but at some point we will reach peak oil. I think we are there or nearly there for conventional oil.

Then at some point in the future, oil and gas will be so hard to find, and so expensive, that other sources of energy will be more attractive. We will look

back in the future at the age of oil, and what an incredible age it was.

If you do a Google search for Hyman Rickover and energy, you will pull up the transcript of this fascinating talk that he gave almost 50 years ago. He, in that talk, goes through a very interesting history of the development of civilization and the role that energy played in the development of that civilization.

All one has to do is kind of reverse the tape, as you may see, when somebody jumps into a swimming pool, and you reverse the tape and they jump back out of the swimming pool. So we can see the contributions energy made to the development of civilization, and you reverse that tape, you can get some idea as to what would happen to our civilization if we are not able to derive energy from other sources equivalent to that, which we are getting from fossil fuels.

The next chart is a very interesting one from CERA, Cambridge Energy Research Associates, and this has several projections of peaking on it.

Now, the title of this article is "Undulating Plateau Versus Peaking," and what they are contending in the article is that those who believe in peaking probably also believe in the tooth fairy, that they are about as probable. But in that article they have this graph which shows a peak. I agree with them that it will not be a smooth plateau, that it will be undulating.

I disagree that it will be that far in the future and it will be that broad. But let's look at this chart. They agree that if we find no additional large quantities of oil, that's the roughly 2 trillion barrels that will have been found, that's the current discovered oil in the previous charts, the peaking will be occurring fairly soon.

If we find another, roughly another trillion barrels by enhanced recovery and going under 7,000 feet of water and 30,000 feet of rock, as that last oil find in the Gulf of Mexico was, that we can get that much more conventional oil. So peaking will be pushed out to about this point.

□ 2030

And then they are looking at unconventional oil. And just a word about some of that unconventional oil. There are incredibly large potential reserves of unconventional oil. For instance, the tar sands of Alberta, Canada, contain more potential oil than all the oil that has been discovered so far. The same thing is true of our oil shales out in Utah and Colorado.

So why aren't we resting easy then that there is no problem for the immediate future because there is this incredible reserve of oil? Now, they believe that we are going to tap a pretty large amount of that.

In Alberta, Canada, they are exploiting this field. They have a shovel which lifts 100 tons at a time. It dumps into a truck which hauls 400 tons, and they carry this 400 tons to a cooker. They

have what is called stranded natural gas in Alberta, a lot of gas and not many people. And since gas is hard to transport, it is not worth much because there is not many people there to use it, so we call it stranded. So its value is low. And from a dollar and cents perspective, they are making a lot of money in Alberta. It is costing between \$18 and \$25 a barrel; that is bringing \$60 a barrel. That is a very handsome profit, so they are aggressively exploiting this field. They are using natural gas to cook the oil. The natural gas will not last forever. They know that, so now they are looking at the possibility of building a nuclear power plant there.

I have asked: How long do you have to operate a nuclear power plant before you get back to the fossil fuel energy it took to build the nuclear power plant? I get wildly divergent estimates of how long that is, which makes the point that we really need for this dialogue, which we really need to have, we really need an honest broker to help us agree on the facts, because it is very difficult to have an enlightened discussion when you can't agree on the facts. That honest broker might very well be the National Academy of Sciences. They are very knowledgeable. They are highly respected, and I think that they would assume this responsibility and I hope that we can find the resources so that they can do that.

Now, the Canadians know that this is not sustainable. The gas will run out. And, in addition to that, this vein, if you think of it as a vein which has now pretty much surfaced, it will shortly duck under a heavy underlay so there will be a lot of material to remove above it, so much so that they could not economically continue to mine it and carry it to the cooker. So then they will have to develop it in situ, in place. They really don't know yet how they would do that.

Now, the real profit that you need to look at in any of these things is what is called energy-profit ratio, how much energy you put in and how much energy you get out. In the big oil fields, and we have no giant oil fields in our country. We have never had one. The Ghawar War Field, perhaps the grand daddy of all oil fields in Saudi Arabia, has been producing oil for a very long time, and for much of its life, it was producing \$100 worth of oil for \$1 worth of investment, energy-profit ratio of 100.

Our oil was never that good. It started out maybe 10 or 20, and now it is down to 1 or 2 energy-profit ratio, how much energy you have to put in compared to how much energy you get out. And so although there are very large potential reserves in these unconventional oil fields, the net that you get out will be very much less. Even if it is feasible to get it out, the net will be very much less than the amount of oil which is there.

Now, they are working very hard in Canada. It is a huge enterprise. They are producing about 1 million barrels a

day. That is a lot. But that is less than 5 percent of what we use in this country, and just a bit more than 1 percent of the 85 million barrels a day that the world uses. So even though this is a tremendous effort and a lot of oil produced, it still is making a fairly small contribution to the total amount of oil in the world.

Now, I would ask the listener, Mr. Speaker, to draw their own conclusions: How much additional oil do you think we will get from current fields with enhanced oil recovery? Even if we get as much more as all of the present projected reserves, that will only push the peak by their own chart, which we saw a bit ago, out to 2016. And if we find double the amount of oil that we have ever found, it pushes it out only to about 2027 or 2028. That is not the distant future.

The next chart is really an interesting one, and I think graphically this kind of presents the dilemma that the world is in, and this is what the geography of world would look like if the size of a country was relative to the amount of oil reserves that it has. It is a really interesting map; isn't it? Saudi Arabia dwarfs everything else. And notice little Kuwait, a tiny corner of Iraq. You can see now why Saddam Hussein was interested in Kuwait, a tiny province down there at the southeastern corner of Iraq, just a fraction of the geography of Iraq, but nearly as big as Iraq. It dwarfs the United States. Here we are; we would fit five times into Kuwait. They have five times the reserves that we have.

Notice the two largest countries in the world, China and India; 1,300,000,000 people in China; 1 billion in India and growing. They don't have the birth control, the population control they have in China, and it won't be very long until India's population is equal to that of China. I mentioned a bit ago that it won't be too long before the middle class in India is the size of our total population, 300 million people. They all want cars. They all want heated and air conditioned homes. All of this takes energy.

So the traditional roughly 2 percent increase per year in energy demand is going to pick up with the development of countries like China and like India. Russia, which is now a huge exporter of oil, notice, they are only four times the size of the United States, a fraction of the size of Saudi Arabia, probably a bit smaller than Kuwait.

Notice where most of the world's oil is. There is some in this hemisphere, in Venezuela, but the rest of it is all northern Africa and the Middle East. Someone had noted that it is very strange that the world of Islam has most of the oil and the Christian world has most of the arable land. It seems to me there ought to be some opportunity for partnering. We can produce the food; they can produce the energy. But those kind of relationships in this confrontational world are hard to achieve.

The next chart is one that further develops this picture. And what this shows is the world, not as that would be proportioned by oil but as it is, and it shows what the symbols here, who is buying oil where. And these symbols for China, you notice one here, they almost bought Unocal in our country, and China is now buying up oil around the world very aggressively, not just buying oil, but in the process making friends. "Would you like a hospital? How about a soccer field?" And the Chinese are doing this all over the world. You can see their symbols where they are all over the world, and notice many of them in that oil rich crest of Africa and the Middle East.

Why are they doing this? The Chinese economy is growing at over 10 percent. The last quarter for which I saw data was 11.4 percent. They have to have observed that oil is fungible; that it really doesn't matter who owns the oil, which is why I didn't have any big problem with them buying Unocal. It doesn't really matter who owns the oil. The country, the company that gets the oil is the high bidder because oil moves in a global marketplace. Today, it was roughly \$61 a barrel. So it doesn't make one bit of difference who owns the oil. The person who has the money, who bids the highest, gets the oil.

So, if this is how oil moves on the world market, why would China be buying up all of this oil? We happen to have one of the largest reserves of coal. We have 250 years of coal at current use rates. But if you increase the use of coal only 2 percent; by the way, this exponential growth is poorly understood by most people. After the discovery of nuclear energy, Dr. Einstein was asked what the next great energy source in the world would be, and he kind of jokingly responded that there was nothing quite like the power of compound interest.

Let me tell you just a little story to help understand this. The story is told that chess was developed in an ancient small kingdom. And the king was very appreciative, and he told the inventor of chess that, "You have made such a contribution to our culture that I will give you anything reasonable that you ask."

And so the inventor said, "Oh, king. I am a very simple man. I have simple needs. If you would just take my chess board with, what, 64 squares on it, and if you put a grain of wheat on the first square and two grains of wheat on the second square and four grains of wheat on the third square and eight on the fourth and so forth until you filled all of the squares of the chess board, that will be an adequate compensation."

The king said to himself, "Foolish fellow. I would have given him anything reasonable. All he is asked for is a little wheat on his chess board."

The king of course could not do that, because the amount of wheat that would have been on that chess board I understand represents a decade of

world harvest of wheat. That is what exponential increase does.

Well, the world has been increasing at about 2 percent a year. That rate of growth will increase. There is an easy formula that you can use. If you divide the percentage growth into 70, it will give you doubling time. So 2 percent growth doubles in 35 years; 10 percent growth doubles in 7 years. So you can now get doubling time if you divide the percent into 70.

This coal that would last us 250 years, if you have only 2 percent increase in growth, that exponential function decreases the duration of its use to just 85 years. And since coal will not be useful for many of the uses of energy that we have, we are going to have to convert it into a gas or a liquid. And the energy to do that if you take it from coal will now reduce the amount of time that that 250 years of coal will last to 50 years.

But since energy sources move on a world market, we might be expected to share that liquid from coal or gas from coal with the rest of the world. And since we use ¼ of the world's energy, that 50 years divided by 4 comes down to 12½ years. So this amazing 250 years of coal suddenly shrinks to just 12½ years at only 2 percent growth if we are sharing it with the rest of the world.

Well, we may decide that, since the coal is ours, that we won't need to share it with the rest of the world if there is an acute energy shortage here.

□ 2045

That would be a logical decision that a country would make.

Now, if we, if there is a possibility we would not want to share our coal with the rest of the world, is there a possibility that China might not want to share their oil, which they have now bought in all of these countries around the world; that they would not want to share their oil with the rest of the world?

Mr. Speaker, with that thought in your mind, you might reflect on the fact that China today is aggressively building a blue water navy. Some I think 60 percent of their oil goes through the Straits of Moloch. We now could cut off that oil.

From a national security perspective, I can understand why they would have a meaningful interest in a blue water navy large enough to protect their supply lines for oil.

By the way, talking about choke points for oil, I think 40 percent of the world's oil moves through the Straits of Hormuz. And if that were mined, or if super tankers were sunk there to block that, 40 percent decrease in the amount of oil would bring all of the world's economies to their knees, essentially overnight. I hope that we are guarding well the Straits of Hormuz because that would, indeed, be the ultimate in asymmetric attack.

I have here a little article called, "Corn Based Plastic Coming Soon."

Now, of course, we live in a plastic world. And all of these plastics are made from oil. If you will look at your car, if you look at your home, you look at your television set, you look at almost anything in your environment, and I suspect this rug was made out of oil. Our pesticides, our herbicides, our pharmaceuticals, our make up, this is all made out of oil or a great part of it is made out of oil. So there is an interest in getting the things we make out of oil, much of our clothing is made out of oil, interested in being able to get these fibers, this material from something else, and so this is an article, "Corn Based Plastic Coming Soon."

Every bushel of corn that we produce requires a lot of fossil fuel energy. And almost half that energy comes from natural gas, which currently is used to make nitrogen fertilizer. Corn, as a plant, is a pig. It requires and uses incredible amounts of nutrients. And we have now engineered hybrid corn so that it can be planted close together. It grows rapidly. It uses the sunlight efficiently, and it uses enormous amounts of energy. And so, this corn based plastic that they are talking about, I don't know what the efficiency there is. But if it is no better than the efficiency of making ethanol, and ethanol, remember, every gallon of ethanol represents at least three-fourths of a gallon of fossil fuel to make it. Some, Dr. Pimenthal, for instance, believes that if you really cost-account all the energy that goes into producing corn, that you use more fossil fuel energy to produce the corn than you get out of the corn. I hope he is wrong. I believe he is wrong. Anyway, after you have produced the ethanol from the corn, you still have a pretty good feed left, and I don't think his calculation took that into effect.

So this corn based plastic really is, in large measure, just recycling fossil fuels. It may make you feel good to say that my shirt is made from corn. But when you recognize the incredible amounts of fossil fuel energy, if it is the same efficiency as using ethanol, at least three-fourths of the fiber of your shirt might just as well have been made from oil because that oil or some fossil fuel source was used in growing the corn from which the plastic was made.

Mr. Speaker, we will continue next week.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agreed to the following resolution:

S. RES. 97

Whereas Thomas F. Eagleton spent his 30-year career in elected office dedicating himself to his country and his home state, representing Missouri in the United States Senate for 18 years;

Whereas Thomas F. Eagleton served in the United States Navy from 1948 until 1949;

Whereas Thomas F. Eagleton, a graduate of Amherst College and Harvard University Law School, launched his political career with his election as St. Louis Circuit Attorney in 1956 and was elected Missouri Attorney General in 1960 and Missouri Lieutenant Governor in 1964;

Whereas Thomas F. Eagleton was elected to the United States Senate in 1968, ultimately serving three terms and leaving an imprint on United States history by co-authoring legislation creating the Pell Grant program to provide youth with higher education assistance, helping to create the National Institute on Aging, and leading the charge to designate 8 federally-protected wilderness areas in southern Missouri;

Whereas Thomas F. Eagleton continued to contribute to his community, state, and nation following his 1986 retirement by practicing law, teaching college courses, writing political commentaries, and encouraging civility in politics;

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable Thomas F. Eagleton, former member of the United States Senate.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate stands adjourned today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the Honorable Thomas F. Eagleton.

RENEWABLE FUELS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARCURI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being recognized and the privilege to address you here on the floor of the United States Congress this evening. And I appreciate the previous speaker, who has brought up the issue of renewable fuels and the overall energy situation that America is addressing here. And this dialogue has got to be expanded and continued, and so this input that comes from the gentleman from Maryland is an essential part of our discussion and our debate. I know that when Professor Bartlett digs up some scientific information and lays it out here for us, we know that it is well researched and it is well founded and well grounded, and that it becomes a significant part of the overall debate.

And I would add some more things to this overall debate as we talk about energy and then, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I will move into some other issues as well that are of important concern to the American people.

On this energy that we are dealing with, I have continually heard from the other side of the aisle, well, we can't drill in ANWR. I haven't heard why. We can't drill in the outer continental shelf. I haven't heard why.

I have heard that we have to conserve energy. I think that is good, but it is hard to do that without having the proper financial incentives in place. And one thing we haven't done is reward the companies for doing the exploration, particularly, the exploration for American oil, Mr. Speaker.

And so, as I look at this overall picture, I will submit this scenario that we need to do, and that is, we must grow the size of the energy pie, this overall circle pie chart that we use that is the 100 percent model. And in there are the components we have today called gasoline, diesel fuel, coal, natural gas, nuclear power, hydroelectric, solar, wind; the list goes on of those components, some hydrogen. But it is a smaller size of supply than we need, and that is why our energy prices are high. And that is linked with the rest of the world, certainly.

But here in the United States, we need to be looking at this from the perspective of reducing and eventually eliminating our dependence upon Middle Eastern oil. That is essential that we do that because the funds that are going into Middle Eastern oil, when we are buying oil on the market, those funds, some of them, end up in the hands of our enemies, in the hands of the terrorists, in the hands of the Islamic jihadists. And that is the strongest incentive to becoming more dependent upon domestic energy and less dependent on Middle Eastern energy.

But additionally, our balance of trade goes the wrong way for us. When we are importing energy from overseas in places like the Middle East, that transfers the wealth of the United States over to and puts it into the countries of the Middle East. And so our approach here needs to be the expansion and the continued promotion of these energy supplies that we have that we can develop here in the United States.

The most obvious of those are the biodiesel components, which have been expanding rapidly here in the United States, and particularly in Iowa and particularly in Iowa's Fifth Congressional District, the western third of the State. We are now and have been for some time the number one congressional district out of all 435 in biodiesel production. And that biodiesel production comes from animal fats and soybeans, and the extraction of that processed into diesel fuel, that has proven to be a very effective and reliable, and much of it a biodegradable type of a fuel, much more environmentally friendly than the diesel fuel that is on the market that comes out of the sands of Saudi Arabia, for example. And so our leadership there in the biodiesel production needs to be expanded, and we are on a track to do that.

We are also, in the district that I represent, ranking number two of the 435 Congressional districts in ethanol production. By some time this year, in 2007, we will be number one in ethanol production. That will rank us first in the Nation in ethanol production of the 435 congressional districts, and also first in the Nation in biodiesel production.

We rank currently today about fourth or at least tied for fourth in wind generation of electricity. That will go up to at least second time this year, and perhaps it will be first.

But some of the things that we are creating here is an intellectual property, Mr. Speaker, a knowledge base that, of the billions of dollars of capital that we have poured into renewable energy, primarily in the ethanol and the biodiesel, but also in the wind generation of electricity, that capital investment produces the energy out of our crops and out of our wind. But additionally, we are building a knowledge base, an understanding of what enzymes work best, what practices work best. We are squeezing more ethanol out of a bushel of corn than we have ever squeezed out of there before, and we will soon be up to that 3 gallons a bushel of ethanol production. And as the enzymes get better and the process gets better, we will also be able to extract ethanol out of the cellulosic, which is about any kind of plant product that is made out of cellulose and other products as well. But that would be the primary ones.

And as we develop our skills, I run into people around the country, especially in our hearings for agriculture, and they will come up to me and say, really, the future for our energy is in ethanol. We need to learn how to do that. We need to go to Brazil and see how they make ethanol in Brazil. And my response to that is, why don't you come to Iowa, see how we make ethanol in Iowa? I have been to Brazil to see their operations down there. They need to come to Iowa to see how we make ethanol in Iowa.

And, in fact, the United States has surpassed Brazil in ethanol production. They make most of theirs out of sugar cane. We make most of ours out of corn. But we passed up Brazil a couple of years ago in overall gallon production of ethanol.

And Iowa produces 26 percent of the ethanol that is produced in the entire country. And our plants are far more modern than those that you see in Brazil. Technology a little different because there they will some days make sugar out of the sugar cane when the market is right, and other days they make ethanol out of the sugar cane. But ours are still far more modern. We conserve energy. We have got efficiencies there. We have software packages that manage and control the flow of all the operations within the plant. We have one or two people sitting there monitoring that 24/7. But an impressive combination of technology and people and know-how pulled together.

And I often, Mr. Speaker, use the model of how Texas was the place where they discovered oil. And among the places, and Texas produced a lot of the oil back starting in the teens to some degree, but more like the 1920s and the 1930s. And as they, the boom State of Texas hit oil, and they began to develop and produce oil and distribute and refine it and distribute it around the country, they also developed the skills, the skills and the expertise of deeper drilling and other ways to extract oil out of the forma-

tions, fishing skills to fish broken bits out of wells, Red Adair's oil well firefighters, some of those examples, and then of course the seismic technology and all of the things that go along to making an oil industry profitable.

Well, as the oil began to play out in Texas, the expertise kept growing, and there is a tremendous amount of wealth in Texas that comes from the intellectual property that has been created, the common knowledge or the knowledge base that has been built.

We are doing the same thing in the Midwest in the renewable fuels category, Mr. Speaker. And as that knowledge base grows, there will be people that are brought up, educated in, work in and nurtured within this epicenter of renewable fuels that we are today in the neighborhood that I have the privilege to represent. And as they look around, they will move outside the area, and they will begin to add their skills to ethanol biodiesel production plants that move out to the limits of the corn belt and the soybean belt.

And as that happens, there will be, of course a center of knowledge, a center of technology and people, can-do people with know-how, that emanate from the epicenter of renewable fuels. That is a big future, I believe, for us. And that is one component in this overall energy pie that we need to grow.

So as we grow our ethanol production from corn and grow our biodiesel production from mostly animal fats or mostly soybeans, but also animal fats, that would be a processing product that comes from our plants. As that grows, we also are looking at developing the cellulosic ethanol, and that can come from any kind of plant. And we are 5 to 6 years away from being able to produce the cellulosic ethanol in the kind of volume where we can see how we might be able to add a lot more gallons to the overall supply of gasoline type products that are consumed on our vehicles on the roads.

□ 2100

And yet where we are, that cellulose comes in the form of corn stalks and cane products and switch grass and the list goes on, wood chips. Anything that has plant and fiber in it is cellulose that can be converted into ethanol. So we don't know to the extent that that will be built out across the country, but I believe this: I think you can draw circles on the map in the corn belt where there will be ethanol plants and they will draw corn from those areas. And then there will be other circles where the biodiesel plants draw soybeans particularly or else extracted oil from soybeans into that area. And the gaps, I think, get filled with cellulosic. And there will also be dual crops that come out at least for some time that convert the shell corn into ethanol and the corn stalks into cellulosic ethanol. That kind of thing will happen too to the extent that the economics will drive this.

Capital makes good decisions on where it goes. It will always being at-

tracted to where there is profit. It will always shy away from places where there isn't profit. And right now the capital is being attracted to the renewable fuels. That is a piece of this overall energy pie, and the size of the piece that is ethanol today and renewable fuels needs to get bigger.

Also, we look out on the Outer Continental Shelf. There are 406 trillion cubic feet of natural gas that we know of offshore, a lot of that offshore in Florida. We opened up a tiny little sliver of that, I think it was Lease 181, to allow for a little more drilling way offshore in Florida, but we are wasting or ignoring a tremendous resource where we should be down there tapping into that massive supply of natural gas, pumping it into our markets here because of the foundation for a lot of our production in our plants, particularly plastic production, is in natural gas, is in feedstock, as well as natural gas is a feedstock for commercial fertilizer, and the control of that fertilizer will also be part of the control for the overall food production in the United States.

So it is essential that we keep at an economic and I will even say a cheap supply of natural gas on the markets. And it is foolish for us to ignore the supply that we have and not be out here extracting that natural gas out from underneath the seabed. There has never been a spilled natural gas that had any environmental damage. It has always been one of the safest things that we can do and certainly one of the cleanest things that we can do. Natural gas is a wonderful product, and that natural gas needs to be put into our markets to keep our fertilizer costs down, to keep our production costs down, and to be used more sparingly in the production of electricity because that is a higher cost type of an item, and that can be done more with coal or with clean burning coal.

And we need to also be expanding our energy use beyond the natural gas. We should look at our domestic supplies of crude oil, and offshore there is also a significant amount of domestic supplies of crude oil. One of the largest fields discovered is southwest of New Orleans, offshore in the Gulf of Mexico. And that supply down there, that find that is discovered by Chevron, can be something that will rival and perhaps exceed one of the large finds up on the North Slope. But the North Slope needs to be opened up too, and I mean specifically ANWR, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. That is an area up there that if God was going to put oil somewhere that we ought to go get that is not going to impact on very many species or on human population, that, Mr. Speaker, is the place.

I have traveled up there, and I have looked at the fields in ANWR. I looked at the oil that is developed on the North Slope of Alaska. And I can see, and I don't think there is a disagreement, that it has been a very environmentally friendly development that

took place up there in the 1970s, and we can do better yet just a little ways to the east in a similar type of a terrain, because we have the technology to allow us to do directional drilling. So we can sit in one spot and we can drill in an area out in multiple directions and extract that oil in a single location with a very minimal footprint on the area up there in ANWR.

There is no justifiable reason not to tap into that. Whatever the promise happened to be back in the 1970s that some people here on the floor of the House have said, well, there was a promise that we would never drill in ANWR or we would never let you drill in the North Slope, well, I don't know who made that promise. I don't see that that promise is in law. I know it is not in the Constitution. But even if it is in law, and I don't believe it is, Mr. Speaker, one legislature, one Congress can't bind a succeeding Congress. They can't make a decision in 1970 that keeps us from doing the right thing in 2007.

And our Founding Fathers would have never taken a position like that. So whoever thinks that they have been disenfranchised by a promise shouldn't have been willing to accept that kind of promise back in the 1970s, if it was ever made. But what would we get out of that, foolishly hanging on to somebody's idea that because it is called the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge that somehow we can't have a little spot there that is equivalent of a postage stamp on a football field to go set a rig there, drill some holes in the ground, and pull that back out and only have a little rock pad about 50 feet wide by 100 feet long that even Dennis Kucinich wouldn't recognize as an oil field except you would have to take him up there and show him. And that is the case for many people that oppose drilling up there.

The oil is there. It is there for a reason. We need to dump it on our market and do it now. A million barrels a day could be coming back down into this market here in the United States, and that is a million barrels a day that we wouldn't be drawing out from Middle Eastern oil, and the profit from that million barrels a day would not be going into the hands of jihadists or potential jihadists or neighbors to jihadists. It would be going into American companies, and it would be saving money in the pockets of the American people, Mr. Speaker.

And those are two logical things that we need to do: drill the Outer Continental Shelf for oil and gas everywhere that we can find it, go up to ANWR and drill up there because we have already found it. We know it is there.

And so those two are simple commonsense inarguable points that can only be addressed in opposition by emotionalism and hyperbole, not by rational logic or empirical data.

And as we look across at the rest of the energy that we need to produce, we are doing a great job with the wind en-

ergy. We have got the wind chargers pumping out electricity. One thing about it, the air really never gets where it wants to go. It keeps traveling around this globe. And we can harness that tremendous amount of energy, and we do so, and turn it into generated electricity, a very clean, a very safe supply of energy. I am glad to see those tall surrealistic windmills churning out all at an identical speed, pumping electricity down through the cables into the ground and on off to our customers. That is a very gratifying thing.

And we would have difficulty, with the political climate that we face today, in expanding our hydroelectricity capability. Whether we can do that or not, I would like for any opportunities and be supportive of the rational ones, but we must keep alive the hydroelectric generation of electricity that is taking place across this country. That is some of the cheapest electricity that we have and some of the safest electricity that we have and some of the most environmentally friendly electricity that we have.

We will have flood control projects on these rivers, or we will have bottoms flooded out continually and, since we built those, particularly Pick-Sloan on the Missouri River when you take advantage of the gravity situation of the water dropping down off of the dams down through the generation plants.

Another place that we need to expand is going to be our nuclear capability. I don't believe we built a new nuclear plant, nuclear electrical generating plant, in the United States since the mid-1970s. And yet statistically nuclear power is by far the safest form of electricity that we have that we can generate. If you want to count the accidents, the fatalities, all the records about the safety of nuclear stand up to support that nuclear is safer than any other. And when you look across the world in places like France, we make a little fun of the French, but they made a good decision on their electricity. They have a different kind of demand than we have, different levels of resources. But their prudent decision sets up nuclear plants in France, and 78 percent of their electricity is generated by nuclear plants.

To the extent that we can generate more electricity with nuclear, that would take the load off the natural gas that is being used in particularly these new plants where they are burning natural gas to generate electricity. That, I believe, is an imprudent path to go down, to build generating plants that plan to burn natural gas, especially if you are doing so in States like Florida that oppose drilling off their own shores where there is gas sitting there in massive quantities but still are building gas-fired generating plants across the State of Florida. Those things add to the negative and make it harder for us.

And I know that there are States that have an ability and a confidence

that they can produce cleaner burning coal, and coal-fired generators have been a very effective and efficient way to generate electricity, the base plants in particular, and there is coal that is hauled all across this country by rail from Wyoming all the way to Georgia, if I remember right, 16 million tons going into Georgia out of Wyoming coal because that is the most economical way they can generate electricity in those areas in Georgia that receive that coal from up in the Powder River Basin in Wyoming.

But the point is to continually grow the size of this energy pie, put more Btus on the market. One of those pieces of the pie needs to be conservation, to save the part that we are wasting, and then expand the size of the pie for the renewable so that there is more ethanol, more biodiesel, more wind-generated electricity, nuclear-generated power, more base plants for coal-fired generating plants and other means that we can use more coal; and in the process of doing that, we have taken the pressure off. There will be less pressure on gasoline, on diesel fuel, on the places we are most vulnerable, from the Middle Eastern oil and Middle Eastern energy.

That is the path we need to follow, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that is the path that is mostly going to be consistent with that that was presented by the gentleman from Maryland who spoke just ahead of me.

But I wanted to talk about the energy issue in the beginning because I intend to, in what is left of this presentation this evening, Mr. Speaker, talk about how we fix our problems here in the United States, how we address our global problems. And I have addressed the energy issue. And when we have cheap energy, we are going to have at least a foundation for a strong economy. That is why energy is important. We can't be hostage to other countries. We can't have someone else draining the profit and the lifeblood off of the workers of Americans by pocketing high profits because they happen to be sitting in a place where there is a lot of energy supply themselves with low input costs. That is the case today with Middle Eastern oil. That is why I raise the energy issue.

The second thing that matters is how we deal with our foreign relations. We are vulnerable to Middle Eastern oil today. Some 60 percent or more of our oil is imported from overseas. And whether you take that directly from places like Saudi Arabia or Iran or Iraq, other countries there in the Middle East, Kuwait, for example, or whether you buy it from the Canadians, and we don't have much access to markets from the Russians, but from the western shore of Africa, wherever that oil comes from, you are taking it from the world market, the overall supply of oil in the world market. And if you do that, it is essentially the equivalent of purchasing the Middle Eastern oil. And when that happens, of

course, as I said two or three times, that money gets into the hands of Islamic jihadists.

And so today we are in a global war against terror and these terrorists are Islamic jihadists. They live scattered across most continents, if not all continents. There are enclaves there, cells where they are training and planning to attack us. They believe they are called by Allah to kill us because they label us as infidels. It says so in their Koran.

Thomas Jefferson bought a Koran or acquired a Koran, and in there he studied it so he that he could begin to understand the Islamic enemy called the Barbary pirates. And the language is the same. It says the same thing today, and the extremists believe that directs them to kill the people that they define as infidels and infidels being described as nonbelievers in their religion.

□ 2115

So, that is the root of this belief. They believe they are commanded to fall upon us and attack us with every stratagem of war and to continue doing so until such time as the infidels either convert or pay tribute.

That was their demand at the beginning of the wars with the Barbary pirates that began in 1784. That war, the long-lasting war with the Barbary pirates, with the same kind of philosophical enemy and nearly same location, that lasted over 30 years, by my calculation 32 years before it was wrapped up. In fact, it may have been a little longer than that.

The resistance finally stopped in 1830 when the French went in and occupied Algiers. We did our part up to that period of time. It is my recollection the United States was in combat about 32 years, or through a drawn-out war for 32 years, about 6 years of intense combat through that period of time, beginning in 1784, the year after hostilities with the British ceased.

So this is not anything new for us. We just need to go back and read our history and understand that they believe they have to kill us, that that is their religious belief to do so. And Thomas Jefferson said so. All we had to do was read Jefferson. He studied. It reflects today about the enemy we are up against.

Now, this even my needs to have some bases to operate from. They had a base to operate from in Afghanistan. The Taliban and the al Qaeda working with the Taliban, they need anarchy. They need a failed state, a state that doesn't have the rule of law, that doesn't have security, that has a collapsed economy, a place where they can operate freely. They had done so with the Taliban, working with al Qaeda in Afghanistan.

When September 11 came, we went to Afghanistan and put an end to their terrorist camp. When it came time to liberate Iraq, it was a similar motive. And we know that al Qaeda has always

seen Iraq since the victorious liberation in Afghanistan, they have always seen Iraq as the central battlefield in this global war on terror, Mr. Speaker.

So, this is the nature of our enemy. And wherever we fight them, they populate most of the continents all around the globe. We have seen the second generation Pakistanis rise up in Great Britain and turn around and plot to and ultimately attack the British people, their hosts in Great Britain. Those kind of cells exist in the United States, they exist in many countries of the world, and that is some of the nature of the enemy we are up against.

So, how do we deal with this kind of enemy? We have addressed it to the extent that we brought a measure of freedom to Afghanistan. We are surely not done there. There is more violence there in the last year, not less. That is a bad sign. We are more aggressive than we have been in the past, not less. That is a good sign. And we have NATO in there now working directly with us, and that is also a very good sign. They have started a spring offensive, and that is going to keep al Qaeda back on their heels. But we may not for a long, long time put this enemy a way to where they quit attacking us.

They don't really have a head leader. They don't have a capital city. They don't have a definable military that we can attack and destroy. But they do attack us with whatever they have, with the resources that they have, and we know that they are in Iraq in significant numbers and we have been fighting there, along with somewhere between five and eight different factions that are engaged in the violence there in Iraq.

But the most pervasive concern that I have, Mr. Speaker, is that Iran has been fighting a proxy war against the United States in Iraq. I have known for approximately 2 years that the Iranians were funding the insurgency there, that they were making munitions, that they were shipping those munitions into Iraq, that they were training and supporting the insurgency in Iraq and committing and fighting a proxy war against the United States within Iraq, from Iran.

Yet the information that we had at the time wasn't quite solid enough to go public, not quite solid enough to accuse the Iranians of what I have known for 2 years they were doing. But today we know. We know they have infiltrated people, military personnel and trainers into Iraq. We know that they are making sophisticated devices to knock out our armored personnel carriers and our tanks and armored Humvees. And we have had at least 170 Americans who have been killed because of these devices, these sophisticated improvised explosive devices. That is an act of war against the United States troops that is taking place in Iraq at the hands of the Iranians.

Now, the downside, the worst case scenario of this is, as I listened over on

this side of the aisle a couple of weeks ago, 2½ weeks ago when we had our debate about the resolution that did this contradictory thing, respected the troops and opposed their mission, a disgraceful debate that we had on the floor, but many Members on that side of the aisle said it is a civil war, that we should get out, we should not be engaged in a civil war.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, it is not a civil war in Iraq. There is not a force in Iraq that is seeking to unseat and depose and replace the duly elected democratic government of Iraq. You have not heard that out of the mouths of the leaders of the insurgencies that are there. They are not there to destroy the government in Iraq. So, that is rule number one. If they are not trying to depose the government, probably it is a pretty good sign it is not a civil war.

Rule number two is there are hundreds of thousands of Iraqis in uniform today that are defending and fighting for Iraqis. These uniformed Iraqi military and security personnel are not choosing up sides to shoot at each other. If they did that, we would maybe have a definition of a civil war. So, since the Iraq military and the Iraq security personnel are not fighting against each other, but they are fighting to provide security in Iraq, that says there is not a civil war. Because no one is trying to depose the legitimate government of Iraq, that says it is not a civil war.

So that puts the argument I think away on that. You can argue there is unrest, and there is, and there are fighting factions that are competing against each other for power in a relative vacuum in some of the areas, but that doesn't constitute a civil war.

But even if it were, Mr. Speaker, I would point out the United States has engaged in a number of civil wars to try to put down the kind of unrest and been successful to some degree. One of those places would be in Kosovo. We have been in there now for more than 10 years. We have suppressed a civil war there and saved a lot of lives and had a measure of safety because of that.

So, it is not a civil war, but if it were, that is not a reason not to be there, Mr. Speaker. There is a very good reason to be there, and I will point out that very good reason, and that is the Iranian hegemony is pervasive in Iraq. They are bonded with and are a powerful, strong influence with the two largest Shia organizations in Baghdad and the areas outside and south of Baghdad, all the way to the southern border.

The Shia region of Iraq would be taken over by the influence of the Iranians. If we pulled out of there, the Iranians would fill that vacuum. Yes, there would be some fighting amongst the other factions, but I believe the Iranians fill that vacuum.

If the Iranians fill the vacuum through their relationships with the

Shia leaders that they have already been nurturing and funding and supporting, one of them would be Moqtada al-Sadr, who has absconded to Iran with his leaders, with the commanding officers of his militia, if that happened, those people get propped up. Sadr gets propped up, Hakeem gets propped up, and the Iranian influence gets ahold of the 70 to 80 percent of the oil in Iraq that is in the area of the Shias today. Maybe eventually all of it, but almost immediately they get their hands on 70 to 80 percent of the Iraqi oil.

Mr. Speaker, if that happens, then you have the Iranians sitting there where their cash boxes will be flushed, their war chest be full. They will be overflowing with cash. They will be able to will buy any kind of nuclear power that they want to buy, any kind of nuclear material they want to buy. They will be able to accelerate and buy more centrifuges and process fuel and develop nuclear weapons at a faster pace, and they aren't far from having that accomplished now.

They will be able to develop a means to delivery that nuclear capability in the form of missiles, and if they aren't able to develop that technology there in Iran, they can pay for it and accelerate their research to get that done. If they aren't, they can turn around and buy that on the open market somewhere, the means to deliver, from places like North Korea, which has demonstrated a propensity for marketing off their nuclear capability.

But I think we are not many years away from Iran having a nuclear capability. And a cash flush Iran with a nuclear capability and a means to deliver it doesn't mean it just threatens Tel Aviv, Mr. Speaker. It isn't just that Ahmadinejad has declared that he wants to annihilate Israel. That is a big deal. They are the only democracy in the Middle East, aside from Iraq today. But Ahmadinejad has vowed to destroy Israel and the United States.

But those missiles and that nuclear capability that they would acquire if we withdraw from that area would give them also the ability to reach Western Europe, the ability one day not very far down the line to reach the United States, and it becomes a far more difficult equation for us to deal with.

This time, this place, right now, is the opportune time to resolve the issue of the conflict in the Middle East. We have invested blood and treasure, precious blood and valuable treasure, and we owe it to the memories of those who have committed their lives and given their lives to this cause to get the issue resolved in Iraq.

We are far from not being able to win there, and anyone who thinks that this is a difficult military situation hasn't read back through American history to see some of the circumstances that we have come out of in the past, Mr. Speaker.

But thinking of the concept of a cash-flush Iran with their hands on the valve that controls 42.6 percent of the

exportable world's oil supply, control of Straits of Hormuz, to be able to fill their coffers up with cash until they overflow, buy their nuclear capability and buy their missiles as a means to deliver it, and then look around the world and say, well, I am called upon by Allah to annihilate you infidels, and I want to start with the Israelis over here, so what I am going to do is maybe not fire off the missile right away, because it might start off a kind of a nuclear firestorm. I will just turn down the valve on the oil and starve the Americans out.

Think what happens Mr. Speaker, if as vulnerable as we are to imported Middle Eastern oil, if we let Ahmadinejad crank down that valve at the Straits of Hormuz and shut down or shut off 42.6 percent of the world's marketable oil supply. It wouldn't take anywhere near that amount to bring this economy in the United States to its knees, because we are too dependent.

If they did that, and our economy would shrink down into at least a recession, most likely a severe depression, and us going into a recession or depression immediately impacts China, China is dependent upon our economy because we are buying a lot of their goods, and China is also dependent upon foreign oil to provide energy for their growing demand that they have. They have a voracious appetite for oil and they are reaching out across the world to purchase more and more oil reserves and find ways to keep that oil flowing into their country.

But if Ahmadinejad gets his hands on that oil, that 70 to 80 percent of the Iraqi oil, and flush with cash cranks that valve down on the world's exportable oil supplies, the United States economy could be pushed into a collapse, Mr. Speaker. The Chinese economy could be pushed into a collapse, Mr. Speaker. And the winner would be Iran, who into have free sailing all over the Middle East, and the winner would also be Russia, who has a tremendous supply of oil. They would become more and more cash flush, more and more rich, more and more able to buy the things that strengthen them militarily.

This equation that I have described, Mr. Speaker, describes why Putin in Russia has been taking a more and more belligerent posture as the weeks and months unfold. He sees this chess game folding out on the world's chess board. I don't know why we can't see it here in the United States Congress, Mr. Speaker. But that is the reality we are faced with in that scenario.

So, we must put our cross hairs on the Iranian nuclear capability today. We must say to them, you will never be a nuclear powered country, you will never have a military means to have nuclear power and a means to deliver it, and we have made a decision that that won't happen here in the United States and we are going to go through every diplomatic channel possible, try

every kind of sanction, every kind of blockade, every kind of diplomacy that we can, to convince Iran they should stop, back off, dismantle their nuclear effort. But that would be the only option for them. The other option would be to eliminate their endeavor to become a military nuclear power.

□ 2130

That is where the negotiations need to start in Iraq. Iran has to back off. They need to understand that their involvement in the proxy war against the United States and Iraq accelerates the day when they will, with a thunderous response, lose their nuclear capability should they persist down this path they are heading down.

That is where the crisis is today. But the people in Iran have something to say about what kind of a country they are. And they have something to say about what kind of country they will become.

I am hopeful that the people in Iran will look at their leader, who appears to be an unstable and very much a vindictive, violent man, and come to the streets of Iran and find a way to replace him with someone who can bring Iran back into the 21st century so they can become a moderate, Islamic state that can deal with science and technology and education and use their oil wealth to help support the people in the country rather than the kind of violence being planned by Ahmadinejad.

That will help a lot, if Iran should become a free country. For example, Afghanistan today is a free country. Iraq today is a free country. Iran sits in the middle. They are a geographical link between the two. If Iran can be flipped over and become a regime-change free country, we will have the core of the Middle East, the center for the kind of Islamic jihadists that are coming after us from around the world, after Western civilization itself. The center would become a free territory where there are far less odds that they would be raising the jihadists that they are in the environment that they have today.

There would still need to be some things done in the mountains of Pakistan and within Saudi Arabia. There needs to be things done in Great Britain, for that matter; but that would take us a long way towards a final victory in the global war on terror. And being able to eliminate real estate and places where they could train and foster terrorism would be an essential key in a final victory against these Islamic jihadists.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken to the issue of energy and why we have to do something about energy, and that is take the money out of the hands of our enemies and put it into the hands and the control of the American people. But at the same time, we must succeed in the Middle East. We have come this far. We are very, very close to being able to see an Iraq that can be an ally, a trading ally, a military ally, a partner that will see us as a friend to them in the Middle East.

It has been a precarious path that we have followed. I believe it has been the right path when you look back and ask the question: What did you know and when did you know it?

You can argue each side of everything, but where we are today is where we are. We must move forward and succeed. The military situation there is not a crisis. It is not precarious, but we do have a situation where there is far too much violence there; and a strategy which has been driven by our President, what is commonly called "the surge," has reduced the casualties in Baghdad and divided Baghdad into nine different sections to where it is far easier to control the smuggling of arms and devices between regions in the city.

If we can resolve that in Iraq, and I believe we will get there if we don't lose our resolve here, then we have taken a giant step forward. As we become less dependent on Middle East oil, the United States gets back on stable footing again.

Now, we have a situation also, though, where it is not just that we are purchasing foreign oil, and that is working against us in our balance of trade. In addition to that, we are importing more and more goods from foreign countries and our trade deficit has gone up from 2 years ago, \$617.7 billion in our trade deficit. Last year it was \$725 billion. This year, the number usually comes out in February, but the trend has been for our trade deficit to increase about 20 percent a year. I think we can look to expect that is going to happen, and we will see a trade deficit in the \$800 billion or more category, Mr. Speaker.

Now, there are those who are not concerned about the trade deficit. They say as long as we can buy cheap products built by cheap labor, we should not be concerned. And they will say because we are deficit spending, we shouldn't be concerned about borrowing money from the Chinese bank, for example.

Well, I would ask those people who are so confident as money shifts in this direction, what would be your ideal kind of economy? Why wouldn't you start with an ideal, lay out the metric for the ideal economy, and then try to achieve the ideal?

I would submit it this way. I would like to have a balance of trade. I would like to not be buying more than we are selling. Any business can think of it in those terms. If you are in business and you are producing \$100,000 worth of product a year and are selling that out on the open market, and you turn around and you are buying back \$110,000 worth of product, it is easy to see you are going in the red. That is how the trade deficit works. There are currencies that change that equation some, and there is credit that changes that, and the credit on our capital; but I would want to ideally start with a balance in trade, and then work to have an export surplus because the

wealth comes back to the United States and we would hold their collateral. That would be one thing.

I would want to have a balanced budget here in the United States. I would want to spend no more than I take in. I am different than the PAYGO argument that comes here because I think we have to keep taxes low so we have a vibrant economy that has an incentive.

We did that. In 2001 and 2003, we did two rounds of tax cuts. That saved our economy from an inevitable recession and perhaps a depression that came from the bursting of the dot-com bubble about the time President Bush took office, and it also came from the September 11 attacks, which we know about, the money we had to spend to set up homeland security and the billions of dollars to protect ourselves, and also the billions of dollars we had to spend militarily to take our fight to the enemy.

But this economy needs to be a strong economy. It needs to be healthy and vibrant. I am for balanced trade, perhaps with an export surplus; and I am for a balanced budget, and I am for paying off the national debt. I think we need to do all of that in the form of reducing the demand on discretionary spending in the United States, by setting up the long-term reform of Social Security and Medicare so that growing entitlement funds can be shrunk down, because as it grows, there is going to be nothing left in the budget except Medicare and Medicaid and the interest on our national debt.

It is always easier to fix the problem earlier than later before it becomes a crisis. We didn't have the political will to do that a couple of years ago when President Bush went across the country and gave speech after speech promoting the reform of Social Security. That needs to be done some time. It will happen when the young people start to come forward and start to have their voice heard, along with the senior citizens in America.

But this budget needs to be balanced. We need to end up with a surplus and collect more than we spend and use that to pay down our national debt. Some of that happened. It happened up until the September 11 attacks. That took us out of the balanced budget that was there.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to get back to it. One of the ways we can do that is not with a gimmick; it is with a total tax reform. The most aggressive organization we have for an agency in America, the one that goes out and really does their job is the Internal Revenue Service. They collect that money that they have due. They are effective and efficient at it.

We have a Tax Code that is more pages than I can remember, and more complicated than anybody can comprehend. And that Tax Code is the best Tax Code that money can buy. K Street here in Washington, D.C. and the lobby that is here has created this Tax Code

by getting their little exemption and their little tax deduction. As this adds up, it gets more complicated and convoluted, and it suppresses the growth in our economy, Mr. Speaker.

So what we need to do is look at this Tax Code that we have and say we can't fix this Tax Code. It is beyond anybody's comprehension how to do it, and it is beyond our ability to get it solved politically. The only thing you can do is take the Tax Code and throw it over the side. I would be happy to pitch it into the bay in Boston Harbor and eliminate the Tax Code and never let it grow back again. Also, eliminate the IRS because there is where it would grow, another type of a tax policy that we have today, and go to a national sales tax, a national consumption tax, a fair tax, Mr. Speaker.

If we do that, we have changed the entire dynamic of our taxation in America. It works like this: Ronald Reagan once said what you tax you get less of. If we stick with the tax side, what you tax you get less of. What we do here, in our lack of infinite wisdom, is Uncle Sam has a first lien on all productivity in America.

If you punch the time clock at 8 in the morning, Uncle Sam wants his money first. You will work there until April 14 or April 15 before he gets his due, and then you can start giving your money to the State and on down the line. After a while, you get to keep some of the fruits of your own labor.

But the Federal Government has the first lien on your labor starting the second you go to work anytime. If you pick up the phone and make those extra sales calls for that commission, he has the first lien on that commission.

If you invest your money and you collect the interest, maybe passbook savings, Uncle Sam has the first lien on the productivity of your investment.

If it is a pension income, if it is Social Security income, if it is capital gains, if it is any kind of productivity at all, your labor, your investment, Uncle Sam has the first lien on all of that productivity.

So people make decisions like, I don't think I want to work that extra overtime this week. It is not really worth it because too big of a piece comes out of my check and goes to the Federal Government. I think I'll take the day off. I am going to enjoy life a little bit. After all, I don't get to keep enough of the money I earn.

Or, I am not going to expand that extra line in my factory because, after all, I am in a tax bracket that says I can maintain a level of comfort here, so I am not going to take that risk because the reward is not great enough. That is part of the vision that is going on also.

I am not going to make the extra phone calls for the extra sales because I don't want to pay the tax. I want to be able to keep the money I earn.

That is the mind-set of anyone. The psychology has always been the reason

a controlled economy, a managed society, like, for example, flat out pure communism or European-style socialism, the reason the Soviet Union collapsed was because they did not let people have an incentive to be productive and let them earn and keep the money they made. They took that away from them, and human beings being not as rational as capital is, but human beings being rational, they make those decisions that I talked about, those decisions like, I am not going to put out this effort.

You have heard this: from each according to their ability, to each according to their need. That was the belief of Karl Marx and that was the belief of Lenin and that was the belief of Mao Tse-Tung.

But the equation that they miss is if you are going to take from a producer according to their ability, and maybe they have the ability to produce five or six times as much as somebody who has the need, why in world would they put out five or six times the productivity of the person who is going to be receiving the fruits of their labor?

The answer to that is of course they won't, and of course they don't, and that is why the economies in managed societies like the Soviet Union will collapse because they don't tap into the best instincts of human nature, which is we want to work hard, we want to produce, we want the fruits of our labor. And by the way, if we are allowed to keep the fruits of our labor, we will also contribute and donate and tithe better than any other people on Earth.

We do all of that, we need to go to a national sales tax, a consumption tax, so you decide when you pay your taxes.

I think there is a Texan here with something boiling up inside him, and I would be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, the Honorable Mr. KING. I have been hearing most of the hour you have been talking about the concepts that I know you and I hold so dear.

There was a group from my hometown, Mr. Speaker, Tyler, Texas, that had come to Washington. They are an inspirational group. They are from Grace Community School. I took them around the Capitol tonight. They know their history. It is great when you see education work.

□ 2145

You see the very things you have been talking about, the free market, at work, and that free enterprise works and that really get backs to our very founding, the Judeo-owe Christian values that were so often espoused as the Declaration of Independence was written.

I have had people say the Constitution itself, there is nothing at all like it. By the way, you cannot send out a letter with the letters addressed or dated as you date them because it says

like for today, March whatever day, all my letters, whatever day, "in the year of our Lord," now this year 2007. I was originally told by the franking people, we do not believe you can send that out with "in the year of our Lord" on there; that may be inappropriate. My comment was, if you are saying it is unconstitutional to date a letter the same way the Constitution is dated, then we have got a real problem here. He did not realize the Constitution is dated in that manner, "in the year of our Lord, 1787."

But anyway, there are groups there are schools where they still learn that kind of history, the very thing my friend Mr. KING has been talking about.

I just wanted to pay tribute to the speaker of this group. I know the rules are that we are not to recognize people in the gallery. So I will not violate the rules, but it is a wonderful group that understands the values, the very values the gentleman from Iowa has been discussing, and it just makes me proud to be an American to hear you talk about the values I grew up on, the values that I know are being instilled in the young people still today.

I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), my good friend, and I would encourage you to keep up the good job.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for picking up on that. There is a reason why there is a strong affinity between this Western Iowan and this Texan and lot of the Texas delegations.

I know that today is the anniversary of the final battle of the Alamo, and I am very much aware of what that means in Texas and across this country. In fact, if you walk into my office, this Iowan's office, framed there is a letter from Colonel Travis. That level of freedom, the Texans reached out for freedom and they had to fight for it a number of times, number of different ways. I like that flag that hangs in Mr. HENSARLING's office that shows a picture of the cannon and says, "Come and take it." That is the right kind of attitude.

We have this freedom here in America, and there are people here that do not want our freedom, they detest our freedom. They just want to take our lives, and to understand an enemy like that goes beyond the scope of our religious foundation and our beliefs. So I think it is important for us to understand this enemy.

I would reflect upon a major from Kentucky whom I spent some time with in the Middle East in the early part of December who said: Thank you for all your prayers. Thank you for the support for our military. We have everything we need. We have the training, the technology. We have the weapons. For men that have to do this job, we have everything we need, but when you pray for us, pray for the American people. Pray that the American people will understand the threat that we are up against, and pray that they will not lose their resolve. We will not lose ours.

I think that might be an appropriate time, unless the gentleman from Texas has another remark to make in watching the clock, Mr. Speaker, I would like to close with that thought, that our military is not going to lose their resolve. They understand this enemy that we are against. This Congress needs to understand this enemy we are against. A majority of the American people understand the enemy we are against, and we have a historical time here.

We can close the door on the legacy of Vietnam, Lebanon, Mogadishu, and we can build upon the success in Afghanistan, and we can close the situation in Iraq and build upon that success. If we do that, we have a bright and free future. If we fail to do that, every enemy that wants to come after us will come after us.

I appreciate again Mr. GOHMERT coming down here, the way you engage with your constituents and the way that you bring these values, these American values out of the heartland to flow all the way through the middle part of the United States here. I am proud to serve with the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Speaker, and I am glad to have had the privilege to address you in this chamber.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ABERCROMBIE (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and until 4:00 p.m. March 7.

Ms. DELAURO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after 4:00 p.m. and until 4:30 p.m. March 7 on account of a death in the family.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week on account of a family medical matter.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of official business in the district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, March 8, 9, 12, and 13.

Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, today and March 7.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, today and March 7.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KUCINICH, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 743. An act to amend title 36, United States Code, to modify the individuals eligible for associate membership in the Military Order of the Purple Heart of the United States of America, Incorporated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution calling on the Government of Uganda and the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) to recommit to a political solution to the conflict in northern Uganda and to recommence vital peace talks, and urging immediate and substantial support for the ongoing peace process from the United States and the international community; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 7, 2007, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

701. A letter from the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Electronic Filing of Notices of Exemption and Exclusion Under Part 4 of the Commission's Regulations (RIN: 3038-AC33) received February 7, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

702. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Material Inspection and Receiving Report (DFARS Case 2003-D085) (RIN: 0750-AE73) received February 9, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

703. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Restriction on Carbon, Alloy, and Armor Steel Plate (DFARS Case 2005-D002) (RIN: 0750-AF17) received February 9, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

704. A letter from the Liaison Officer, DoD, Department of Defense, transmitting the De-

partment's final rule — DoD Policy on Organizations That Seek to Represent or Organize Members of the Armed Forces in Negotiation or Collective Bargaining [DOD-2006-OS-0057] (RIN: 0790-AH99) received February 9, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

705. A letter from the Liaison Officer, DoD, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Service by Members of the Armed Forces on State and Local Juries [DOD-2006-OS-0204] (RIN: 0790-AI07) received February 9, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

706. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Assessments (RIN: 3064-AD09) received December 29, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

707. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — State Operating Permit Programs; West Virginia; Amendment to the Definitions of a "Major Source" and "Volatile Organic Compound" [EPA-R03-OAR-2006-0625; FRL-8280-8] received February 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

708. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Financial Accounting, Reporting and Records Retention Requirements Under the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 2005 (FERC Docket No. RM06-11-000) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

709. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — List of Approved Spent Fuel Storage Casks: NUHOMS HD Addition (RIN: 31 50-AH93) received December 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

710. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36 (b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 07-10, concerning the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Taiwan for defense articles and services, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

711. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting an annual report required by section 655 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, pursuant to Public Law 104-164, section 655(a) (110 Stat. 1435); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

712. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

713. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary for Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report that the Department intends to impose new foreign policy-based export controls on exports of certain items under the authority of Section 6 of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended, and continued by Executive Order 13222 of August 17, 2001, as extended by the Notice of August 7, 2003; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

714. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to Section 3 of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended,

detailing possible unauthorized retransfers and misuses of defense articles; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

715. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the quarterly report of obligations and outlays of FY 2004, FY 2005 and FY 2006 funds under the Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief through September 30, 2006, 2006 pursuant to Division D, Pub. L. 108-199; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

716. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Pub. L. 107-243), the Authorization for the Use of Force Against Iraq Resolution (Pub. L. 102-1), and in order to keep the Congress fully informed, a report prepared by the Department of State for the December 21, 2006 — February 21, 2007 reporting period including matters relating to post-liberation Iraq under Section 7 of the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998 (Pub. L. 105-338); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

717. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the fifty-fifth Semiannual Report to Congress on management decisions and final actions taken on audit recommendations, covering the period April 1, 2006 through September 30, 2006 in compliance with the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

718. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

719. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

720. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

721. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

722. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, OARM, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

723. A letter from the Director, Peace Corps, transmitting in accordance with Section 647(b) of Division F of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY 2004, Pub. L. 108-199, the Corps' report on competitive sourcing efforts for FY 2006; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

724. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a copy of the annual report for Calendar Year 2006, in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

725. A letter from the Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the budget request for the Office of Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, for fiscal year 2008, prepared in compliance with OMB Circular No. A-11; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

726. A letter from the Inspector General, Small Business Administration, transmitting the semiannual report of the Office of Inspector General for the period April 1, 2006 through September 30, 2006, pursuant to 5

U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

727. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for New York [Docket No. 051128313-6029-02; I.D. 120406C] received December 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

728. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Conducting Precision Strike Weapons Testing and Training by Eglin Air Force Base in the Gulf of Mexico [Docket No. 060629183-6289-02; I.D. 022106A] (RIN: 0648-AT39) received December 29, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

729. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Commercial Shark Management Measures [Docket No. 060925247-6323-02; I.D. 091106B] (RIN: 0648-AU84) received December 29, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

730. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Establishment of the Outer Coastal Plain Viticultural Area (2003R-166P) [T.D. TTB-58; Re: Notice No. 59] (RIN: 1513-AB13) received February 8, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

731. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's Congressional Justification of Budget Estimates for Fiscal Year 2008, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 231f(f); jointly to the Committees on Appropriations, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Filed on January 2, 2007]

Mr. EHLERS: Committee on House Administration. Report on the Activities of the Committee on House Administration During the 109th Congress (Rept. 109-752). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Filed on March 6, 2007]

Ms. MATSUI: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 214. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 569) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for sewer overflow control grants (Rept. 110-31). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CARDOZA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 215. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 700) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to extend the pilot program for alternative water source projects (Rept. 110-32). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 799. A bill to

reauthorize and improve the program authorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, with an amendment (Rept. 110-33). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H.R. 1327. A bill to direct the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to complete its rulemaking on Employer Payment for Personal Protective Equipment for workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FALOMAVAEGA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BOREN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KIND, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. BACA, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. RENZI, Mr. WU, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KAGEN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. BONO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. FILNER, Mr. McKEON, and Ms. SOLIS):

H.R. 1328. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to revise and extend that Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARTON of Texas (for himself and Mr. DEAL of Georgia):

H.R. 1329. A bill to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to make available additional amounts to address the funding shortfalls in the State Children's Health Insurance Program for fiscal year 2007; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARNEY (for himself and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H.R. 1330. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to extend the time limit for the use of education assistance by members of the Selected Reserve and members of the reserve component supporting contingency operations and certain other operations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. DeFAZIO, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KIND, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. McCAUL of Texas, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MILLER of North Caro-

lina, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SHULER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WAMP, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 1331. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for new qualified plug-in hybrid motor vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BEAN (for herself, Mr. CHABOT, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 1332. A bill to improve the access to capital programs of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. GERLACH, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. KIRK, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. FOXX, Mr. McCAUL of Texas, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. RENZI, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 1333. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Secretary to enter into an agreement with the Secretary of the Air Force to use Civil Air Patrol personnel and resources to support homeland security missions; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 1334. A bill to provide for the tax treatment of income received in connection with the litigation concerning the Exxon Valdez oil spill, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina:

H.R. 1335. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 508 East Main Street in Seneca, South Carolina, as the "S/Sgt Lewis G. Watkins Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1336. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to require the Secretary of the Interior to update the feasibility and suitability studies of four national historic trails, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. COLE of Oklahoma:

H.R. 1337. A bill to provide for a feasibility study of alternatives to augment the water supplies of the Central Oklahoma Master Conservancy District and cities served by the District; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. HONDA, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. CARSON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. WYNN, Ms.

ESHOO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. OBEY, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BACA, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1338. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FORTUÑO:

H.R. 1339. A bill to make residents of Puerto Rico eligible for the earned income tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORTUÑO:

H.R. 1340. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to promote freedom, fairness, and economic opportunity by establishing National Enterprise Zones to promote prosperity in economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILLMOR (for himself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina):

H.R. 1341. A bill to require corporate income reported to the Internal Revenue Service to be included in annual reports to the Securities and Exchange Commission; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GINGREY:

H.R. 1342. A bill to suspend the visa waiver program until certain entry-exit control requirements are met, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (for himself and Mr. PICKERING):

H.R. 1343. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide additional authorizations of appropriations for the health centers program under section 330 of such Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. HERSETH (for herself, Mr. POMEROY, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 1344. A bill to improve Federal nutrition programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HIGGINS (for himself, Mr. REYNOLDS, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 1345. A bill to amend the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 to include certain former nuclear weapons program workers in the Special Exposure Cohort under the energy employees occupational illness compensation program; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA,

Mr. HARE, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PAUL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. STARK, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. KAGEN):

H.R. 1346. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to direct local educational agencies to release secondary school student information to military recruiters if the student's parent provides written consent for the release, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. HOOLEY (for herself, Ms. BEAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. KIND, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. BAIRD, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. ROSS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TANNER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and Mr. BOREN):

H.R. 1347. A bill to extend the period during which members of the Armed Forces deployed in contingency operations may request and receive reimbursement for helmet pads, which are designed to protect the wearer from bomb blasts and non-ballistic impacts, that are purchased by such members; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

H.R. 1348. A bill to redesignate the National Institute on Drug Abuse as the National Institute on Diseases of Addiction, and to redesignate the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism as the National Institute on Alcohol Disorders and Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 1349. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 1993 increase in income taxes on Social Security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EHLERS (for himself, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. KIRK, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. WALBERG, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. STUPAK):

H.R. 1350. A bill to establish a collaborative program to protect the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, Science and Technology, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself and Mrs. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 1351. A bill to amend the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 to authorize the Administrator of the United States Fire Administration to provide assistance to firefighting task forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GEORGE

MILLER of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. FARR, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. NADLER, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. WATSON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. SIREN):

H.R. 1352. A bill to prohibit the return or other transfer of persons by the United States, for the purpose of detention, interrogation, trial, or otherwise, to countries where torture or other inhuman treatment of persons occurs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Kansas (for himself and Mr. SALAZAR):

H.R. 1353. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to ensure that the receipts and disbursements of the Social Security trust funds are not included in a unified Federal budget and to provide that Social Security contributions are used to protect Social Security solvency by mandating that Trust Fund monies cannot be diverted to create private accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MORAN of Virginia (for himself, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. STARK, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HARE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. WU, Mr. FILNER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. CARSON, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BOYD of Florida, and Mr. ROTHMAN):

H.R. 1354. A bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, to improve benefits and services for members of the Armed Forces, veterans of the Global War on Terrorism, and other veterans, to require reports on the effects of the Global War on Terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MYRICK (for herself and Mr. MCINTYRE):

H.R. 1355. A bill to improve sharing of immigration information among Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials, to improve State and local enforcement of immigration laws, and for other purposes; to

the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. MICA, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. PETRI) (all by request):

H.R. 1356. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal years 2008 through 2010, to improve aviation safety and capacity, to provide stable, cost-based funding for the national aviation system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Science and Technology, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas):

H.R. 1357. A bill to require divestiture of current investments in Iran, to prohibit future investments in Iran, and to require disclosure to investors of information relating to such investments; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SHADEGG (for himself, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. RENZI):

H.R. 1358. A bill to create a new non-immigrant visa category for registered nurses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHADEGG (for himself, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. FOXX, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HERGER, Mr. AKIN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mrs. MYRICK):

H.R. 1359. A bill to require Congress to specify the source of authority under the United States Constitution for the enactment of laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SHAYS:

H.R. 1360. A bill to amend title 4 of the United States Code to limit the extent to which States may tax the compensation earned by nonresident telecommuters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. BAKER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 1361. A bill to improve the disaster relief programs of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 1362. A bill to reform acquisition practices of the Federal Government; to the

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WOOLSEY (for herself and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 1363. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to improve the nutrition and health of schoolchildren by updating the definition of "food of minimal nutritional value" to conform to current nutrition science and to protect the Federal investment in the national school lunch and breakfast programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself and Mrs. BONO):

H. Con. Res. 81. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding bone marrow diseases; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

H. Con. Res. 82. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued in honor of the USS New Jersey and all those who served aboard her; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. POE (for himself, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. GOODE, Mr. WAMP, Mr. AKIN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. HUNTER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. MCCRERY, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. BILBRAY):

H. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that State and local governments should be supported for taking actions to discourage illegal immigration and that legislation should be enacted to ease the burden on State and local governments for taking such actions; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H. Res. 216. A resolution commending the Juniata College volleyball team for winning the NCAA Division III Women's Volleyball Championship; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WU:

H. Res. 217. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives concerning the 50th anniversary of Celilo Falls; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. LATOURETTE introduced a bill (H.R. 1364) for the relief of Zdenko Lisak; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS TO PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 23: Mr. REYES.
H.R. 39: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 74: Mr. HILL.
H.R. 101: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 133: Mr. EVERETT.
H.R. 140: Mr. GORDON and Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 146: Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 157: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 216: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 217: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 243: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 367: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.
H.R. 413: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 419: Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.
H.R. 436: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 464: Ms. WATSON.
H.R. 507: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SPACE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. REYES, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 549: Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. RADANOVICH, and Ms. CARSON.
H.R. 570: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 588: Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 642: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 643: Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 661: Mr. WU.
H.R. 662: Mr. FATTAH, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 694: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 710: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HELLER, and Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 718: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. CUBIN, and Mr. ALEXANDER.
H.R. 721: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BOYD of Florida, and Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 727: Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 736: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 746: Ms. NORTON and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 748: Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 769: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.
H.R. 787: Ms. CLARKE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SIRES, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 805: Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, and Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 814: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 822: Mr. RUSH and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 847: Mr. PEARCE and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 869: Mr. SPACE, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 872: Mr. REYES and Mr. KAGEN.
H.R. 873: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 876: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 887: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 901: Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 913: Mr. LAMPSON.
H.R. 916: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 931: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
H.R. 933: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 938: Mr. BOOZMAN.
H.R. 947: Ms. KILPATRICK.
H.R. 950: Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 962: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 971: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. HERGER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. SALAZAR.
H.R. 972: Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 1017: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1030: Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 1031: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. LEE, Ms. WATSON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 1032: Ms. WATSON and Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 1038: Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 1055: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1061: Mr. WELCH of Vermont.
H.R. 1072: Mr. RUSH, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 1073: Mr. WEINER, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1076: Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 1082: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. STARK, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. ELLISON, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1092: Mr. McDERMOTT.
H.R. 1093: Mr. FARR, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1125: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. MACK, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MATHE-SON, Mr. RENZI, Mr. PAUL, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 1126: Ms. SUTTON, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, and Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 1144: Mr. COHEN, Ms. DeGETTE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JINDAL, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 1146: Mr. EVERETT.
H.R. 1152: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
H.R. 1176: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1192: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 1238: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 1250: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 1261: Mr. MACK, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. CANNON, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. McCAUL of Texas.

H.R. 1280: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HILL, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 1283: Mr. COOPER and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1303: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

H.R. 1307: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. McCAUL of Texas, and Mr. EVERETT.

H.R. 1308: Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 1324: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Mr. BOSWELL.

H.J. Res. 14: Mr. RAHALL, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. FILNER.

H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. KINGSTON.

H. Con. Res. 53: Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. TERRY.

H. Con. Res. 71: Mrs. MYRICK.

H. Res. 49: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. PASTOR.

H. Res. 87: Mr. CARNEY.

H. Res. 97: Mr. OLVER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SIRE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. REYES, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. STARK.

H. Res. 101: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H. Res. 107: Mr. FATTAH.

H. Res. 121: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H. Res. 136: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. KIND, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MICA, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H. Res. 149: Mr. HALL of New York.

H. Res. 158: Mr. PICKERING, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. HERGER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. TERRY, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. WALBERG.

H. Res. 182: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. COHEN.

H. Res. 186: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Res. 196: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H. Res. 197: Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WYNN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. BACA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. DeGETTE, Mr. OLVER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. REYES, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H. Res. 208: Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. McNULTY.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 866: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 569

OFFERED BY: MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 1: At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 3. REQUIREMENT OF OFFSETS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No authorization of appropriations made by this Act or other provision of this Act that results in costs to the Federal Government shall be effective except to the extent that this Act provides for offsetting decreases in spending of the Federal Government, such that the net effect of this Act does not either increase the Federal deficit or reduce the Federal surplus.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms “deficit” and “surplus” have the meanings given such terms in the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.).

H.R. 569

OFFERED BY: MR. ROHRBACHER

AMENDMENT No. 2: Page 5, after line 9, add the following:

(e) PARTICIPATION IN EMPLOYMENT ELIGIBILITY VERIFICATION PILOT PROGRAM.—Section 221 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1300) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j) PARTICIPATION IN EMPLOYMENT ELIGIBILITY VERIFICATION PILOT PROGRAM.—The Administrator may make a grant to a State, municipality, or municipal entity under subsection (a) only if the State, municipality, or municipal entity provides assurances satisfactory to the Administrator that the State, municipality, or municipal entity will impose conditions requiring all persons, including contractors and subcontractors, carrying out activities using amounts of the grant—

“(1) to elect to participate in the basic pilot program described in section 403(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note); and

“(2) to comply with the terms and conditions of the election.”.

H.R. 569

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT No. 3: Page 4, line 6, strike “\$250,000,000” and insert “\$237,500,000”.

Page 4, line 7, strike “\$300,000,000” and insert “\$285,000,000”.

Page 4, line 7, strike “\$350,000,000” and insert “\$332,500,000”.

Page 4, line 8, strike “\$400,000,000” and insert “\$380,000,000”.

Page 4, line 9, strike “\$500,000,000” and insert “\$475,000,000”.

H.R. 700

OFFERED BY: MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 1: At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 3. REQUIREMENT OF OFFSETS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No authorization of appropriations made by this Act or other provision of this Act that results in costs to the Federal Government shall be effective except to the extent that this Act provides for offsetting decreases in spending of the Federal Government, such that the net effect of this Act does not either increase the Federal deficit or reduce the Federal surplus.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms “deficit” and “surplus” have the meanings given such terms in the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.).

H.R. 700

OFFERED BY: MR. ROHRBACHER

AMENDMENT No. 2: Page 2, after line 5, insert the following:

(a) PARTICIPATION IN EMPLOYMENT ELIGIBILITY VERIFICATION PILOT PROGRAM.—Section 220(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1300(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking “The Administrator” and inserting the following:

“(1) AUTHORITY UNDER STATE LAW.—The Administrator”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) PARTICIPATION IN EMPLOYMENT ELIGIBILITY VERIFICATION PILOT PROGRAM.—The Administrator may make a grant under this section to an entity only if the entity provides assurances satisfactory to the Administrator that the entity will impose conditions requiring all persons, including contractors and subcontractors, carrying out activities using amounts of the grant—

“(A) to elect to participate in the basic pilot program described in section 403(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note); and

“(B) to comply with the terms and conditions of the election.”.

Page 2, at the beginning of line 6, insert “(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—”.

H.R. 700

OFFERED BY: MR. CONAWAY

AMENDMENT No. 3: Page 2, after line 5, insert the following:

(a) SELECTION OF PROJECTS.—Section 220(d)(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1300(d)(2)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “or whether the project is located in an area which is served by a public water system serving 10,000 individuals or fewer”.

Page 2, at the beginning of line 6, insert the following:

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

H.R. 700

OFFERED BY: MR. KUCINICH

AMENDMENT No. 4: Page 2, after line 5, insert the following:

(a) ELIGIBILITY.—Section 220(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1300(c)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end “and the entity does not permit the use of its water for retail sale of water in containers of 5.7 gallons (20 liters) or less”.

Page 2, line 6, before “Section” insert “(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—”.

H.R. 700

OFFERED BY: MR. SESSIONS

AMENDMENT No. 5: Page 2, line 9, after the dollar amount insert “for fiscal years ending before October 1, 2008”.